



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 952,999



Full Mc Br... *13^c* *4*

ON PHILIP MASSINGER.

A DISSERTATION

97602

FOR THE

ACQUISITION OF THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

FROM THE

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPSIC

BY

JAMES PHELAN

OF MEMPHIS U. A. S.

HALLE,

E. KARRAS, PRINTER.

1878.

822.8

M420

P5

CORRECTIONS.

- Pag. 5, Note 1. The apostrophe should be at the end of l. 23, not in the beginning of l. 24.
- „ 10, l. 3 from bottom. Dele and.
- „ 11, l. 7 from bottom. Dele apostrophe after done.
- „ 13, l. 15 from top. Dele to after to evade.
- „ 19, l. 8 from top. For Martyrs read Martyr.
- „ 20, l. 7 from top. Add an apostrophe after conclusions.
- „ 23, l. 4 from top. For works read words.
- „ 31, l. 13 from bottom. For litterary read literary.
- „ 32, Note 1, l. 3 from bottom. For me read him.
- „ ibid. l. 2 from bottom. Dele apostrophe after Fogo.
- „ 33, l. 10 from top. For sufficently read sufficient.
- „ 35, l. 17 from top. Dele comma after grounds.
- „ 38, l. 9 from bottom. For shot read spot.
- „ 39, l. 14 from top. For Sydney read Sidney.
- „ 48, l. 48 from bottom. Dele apostrophe after it.
- „ 51, Note 1. Strike out the words with the plays.
- „ 56, l. 15 from bottom. Put in an apostrophe after Acter.
- „ 58, Note 1. Dele as after Literature.
- „ 61, l. 11 from bottom. Dele comma after unnaturalness.
- „ ibid. l. 6 from bottom. Add an apostrophe after mentions.
- „ 62, l. 11 from top. Put in an apostrophe after century.
-

PHILIP MASSINGER.

I. Life of Philip Massinger.

Philip Massinger, one of the greatest English dramatic poets, was born in the year 1584, in or near Salisbury and Gifford¹⁾ conjectures, at Wilton, the country-seat of Henry Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. His father's name was Arthur, his mother's Ann.²⁾ The family was originally from Gloucester.³⁾ According to Massinger's own testimony⁴⁾, his father was a servant to the Herbert family, in the service of whose honourable house he 'spent many years happily'. In the first edition of *'The Bondman'* the name of his father is given as Arthur Massinger; through ignorance, or most probably carelessness, the name is printed in the second edition, which appeared fourteen years later, about the time of Massinger's death, Philip. This change caused much confusion until the time of Oldys⁵⁾, who first pointed out that the real name was Arthur. Gifford⁶⁾ of course chastises the previous editors of Massinger for their carelessness in not having noticed the discrepancy. Considering that of the large amount of evidence which proves the name to have been Arthur, Gifford knew but

¹⁾ The Plays of Philip Massinger, with notes critical and explanatory, by William Gifford Esqr. 4 vols. London 1805: vol. I. Introduction p. III.

²⁾ We learn the name of his mother who was buried in Gloucester, from an inscription in the cathedral church, given in *'A new History of Gloucestershire'*, by Samuel Rudden, Cirencester 1779. p. 173'.

³⁾ For an accurate history of the Massinger family, see *'Genealogy of the Massinger family'*, by Geo. W. Messinger, published in Boston.

⁴⁾ Dedication of *'The Bondman'* and *'A new Way to pay Old Debts'*.

⁵⁾ MS. notes to Langbaine, in British Museum.

⁶⁾ Introduction p. I. note.

the first edition of *'The Bondman'*, the punishment seems undeservedly severe, coming from him.

The exact position which Arthur Massinger held under the Herberts, has not been accurately ascertained. It can be placed beyond doubt, that it was not only not menial, but one highly honourable. The writers on the poet all agree as regards this point, but give scarcely sufficient reason for their belief. There is a great amount of evidence, which they have neglected. It is well to be clear on this point as it throws much light on several points of Massinger's life, and settles at least one very disputed question. The dispute turns to a great extent upon the meaning of the word 'servant'.¹⁾

We have four different authorities and several facts, as regards the rank of Philip Massinger by birth, that is, the position of his father in the service of the Pembroke family, which prove that this service could not have been menial. Langbaine²⁾ says 'Massinger was son to Philip Massinger, a Gentleman belonging to the Earl of Montgomery'. As shown above, Philip should read Arthur. Anthony a Wood, whom Gifford³⁾ styles a drudge, speaks of Philip's father as being a servant belonging to the Pembrochian family.⁴⁾ He was matriculated at the University of Oxford as '*generosi filius*', the son of a gentleman. He himself says his father was a 'servant' to the Earl of Pembroke's family. By comparing these four statements it will be seen that Langbaine makes his assertion upon the authority of the matriculation, or at least, that the two agree. Wood rests his upon the dedication of *'The Bondman'*. That Wood's knowledge of Massinger rests almost entirely upon those works of the poet, which he himself saw,

¹⁾ Massinger speaks of his father having been 'a servant' to the Herbert family. The Earl, in one or two of his letters mentions his 'servant Massinger'.

²⁾ *An account of the English Dramatick Poets*, by Gerard Langbaine, 2 vols. Oxford 1691. vol. II. p. 352. This is a mistake of Langbaine's as to the title of 'Earl of Montgomery', as this title was first conferred on Philip Herbert, the younger son of the patron of Massinger's father. First pointed out by Davies.

³⁾ He calls him a 'tasteless but useful drudge'. Introduction p. VI.

⁴⁾ *Athenae Oxonienses*. By Anthony a Wood. Edited by Philip Bliss. 4 vols. London 1815. vol. III. p. 654.

seems clear enough, as the following facts may show. He, as many others who followed him, had seen but the second edition of '*The Bondman*', and makes the usual mistake as regards the name of the poet's father. Furthermore he makes a most startling mistake as to the age of young Massinger on entering the University, one still more inexplicable as to the year of his entrance. He seems to rest his assertion that Massinger left without the honour of a degree, upon the statement that he devoted too little time to 'logic and philosophy'. He attributes to Massinger a work which was not his, because it had P. M. on the title-page.

We have then Wood's statement founded upon the dedication of '*The Bondman*', which says his father was a servant to the Herbert family, and Langbaine's, which agrees with the matriculation: two different, and as it appears at first glance, two dissimilar statements. Though apparently dissimilar, they in reality coincide.

The matriculation as well as the dedication comes from Massinger, he styling himself as he matriculated, the son of a gentleman. As both come from Massinger, they must necessarily agree; hence all solutions and explanations of the two which may be offered and which do not end in the same result, are necessarily false. If either the dedication or matriculation be false, then Massinger is unreliable, which is of course absurd.

Under the old feudal system, when a nobleman trusted more to himself and his retainers to obtain what he considered his dues, than to a sheriff and his posse, the lesser knights, unable to protect themselves, placed themselves under the protection of more powerful Lords, and for this protection and other concomitant rights, the knight who had so bound himself was obliged to do military service. He lived on the most intimate terms with his senior, in the house of the latter, and was consulted on all important occasions. It was in those times considered no disgrace or dishonor to be so bound to a great Lord; the Knights were esteemed and respected, and took rank among others of the same class according with the greatness and power of their Feudal Lord. In the time of Arthur Massinger, the form and conditions of service had been, were being modified, greatly so. Yet the same ideas which

attached to the former more military service, were now becoming general in their application to the civil service, where the servant or one serving held his position at the will of the greater Lord. This latter, who only chose those agreeable to himself and of whose honourable character or birth, or both, according to circumstances, he could be certain, was also responsible for the conduct of those who received a position outside of his own household on his recommendation. The word Knight-service was then in general use. Gifford¹⁾ points out, that at that time 'servant' was synonymous with lover. A Knight was a servant of his Lord, or more properly speaking, a servant to his Lord, that is, in the service of his Lord. Such was the position of Arthur Massinger. There are besides this several manuscripts and letters extant which show how high the father of our poet stood in the favour of the Earl of Pembroke. 'Mr. Massinger' is recommended by the Earl of Pembroke, in a letter dated March 28th 1587²⁾ to the Lord Treasurer or to Queen Elisabeth, for the 'Reversion of Examiner's Office' in the 'Court of the Marches of Wales'. In a letter³⁾ dated August 11th 1590, written by the Earl to Lord Burghley concerning a suspected conspiracy in the Marches of Wales, the Earl acknowledges the receipt of the declaration of one Philip Hall, and then continues, 'I was also made acquainted by this said Hall with a matter concerning the said Herbert, and with many other things (the particulars whereof I refer to my servant Massinger's report).' At the end of the MS. a part has been torn away. He says something however about his servant's report, and desires his Lordship to credit him, that is Arthur Massinger. Again in a letter⁴⁾ written as the above at Wilton, and dated 11th September of the same year, the Earl says 'I have none but my servant Massinger to attend your Lordship (Lord Burghley) for those causes concerning the counsellors in the Marches etc.' This is also a confidential communication.

¹⁾ In a note to '*The Unnatural Combat*'. vol. I. p. 185.

²⁾ *Calendar of State Papers*. London 1581—90. *Domestic Series*. London 1865. p. 398.

³⁾ Lansdowne Collection of MSS. in the British Museum. 1590, fol. 63, No. 74.

⁴⁾ Fol. 63, No. 77 of the same Collection of MSS.

Arthur Massinger was called upon in 1591 by the Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Council at the Star Chamber, to answer a petition which had been presented against the Earl of Pembroke.¹⁾

In another letter²⁾ written September 3rd 1597, Lord Pembroke writes to Lord Burghley: 'My servant Massinger has delivered your most kind letters and acquainted me in reference to the intended marriage between my eldest son and the Lady Bridget'.

In the *Sidney Letters*, first quoted by Oldys,³⁾ 'our Mr. Massinger' is spoken of, as having been sent by the Earl of Pembroke to Queen Elisabeth to request her permission for

¹⁾ Lansdowne Collection of MSS. fol. 67, 8. On the back of two petitions, or copies of petitions has been written: 'The copies of the petition exhibited by Sir Henry Barkley to the Lords of the Privy Council against the Earl of Pembroke, and the answer of Arthur Massinger servant to the said Earl, on his Lord and Master's behalf'. The petition is titled, '*The Humble petition of Sir Henry Barkley*', in which the Knight begs that the Earl of Pembroke should not be allowed to remove him from command of a regiment of men in the County of Somerset and sets forth the reasons wherefore not. Endorsed: 'The Earl of Pembroke's servant Mr. Massinger is ordered to answer on his behalf to the Lords of the Council with all expedition. At Star Chamber the 7th of May 1591. A. Ashley.'

'Then follows 'The answer of Arthur Massinger servant to the Earl of Pembroke, on his Lord and Master's behalf, to a petition exhibited by Sir Henry Barkley Knight, which petition the said Arthur Massinger by order from the Lords of Her Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council was commanded to answer.' And then the answer, which is written in such a manner as shows Arthur Massinger was a man of education, which is necessarily presupposed by the fact that he was selected to answer the petition. The framers of the Catalogue to the Lansdowne Collection make a mistake as regards Arthur Massinger's position. They say on p. 125 of Catalogue, No. 67. 8. 'Sir Henry Barkleys petition with an answer of Arthur Massinger Deputy Lieutenant 'The compiler has overlooked the name of Francis Hastings, who was Deputy Lieutenant, and whose notes are annexed, as is stated in the 'Answer'.

²⁾ *Calendar of State Papers. Domestic Series* 1595—97. London 1869, p. 497. There are several letters written by the Earl on this subject. Another besides the one given above, is also in the same calendar, written in August of the same year.

³⁾ MS. Notes to Langbaine, in the British Museum.

his lordship to be absent 'on St. George's Day 1591'. Davies¹⁾ makes some very just comments on this fact, and considers that a proof that Arthur Massinger could have been no mean person, to have been sent with letters to so punctilious a Lady as Queen Elisabeth since 'no Monarch ever exacted from the nobility in general, and the officers of state in particular, a more rigid and scrupulous compliance to stated order than this Princess'.

From all of this testimony we get an idea of how greatly Arthur Massinger was favoured by the Earl of Pembroke. We see that he had confided to him the particulars of a suspected conspiracy; that he negotiated a marriage between two families, at that time among the most powerful; that he was trusted with matters of a secret nature²⁾, which the Earl did not see fit to confide to paper; that he was selected to answer a petition preferred against the Earl to the Privy Council, and that he was sent to Court with letters for the Queen.

But although from this we learn that Arthur Massinger was a man of education and culture, who had seen much of the world, it does not let us know the exact position which he held in the Herbert family. But still we see how highly honourable and agreeable it was. We arrive at an approximate certainty of his position. He was a retainer of the Earl, in whom the latter had the greatest confidence. His position as such was, as we have every reason to believe, agreeable though not so lucrative as we might wish, as we shall see hereafter. He was a man of experience, ability and learning. His attachment to the Earl, in whose service he spent more than half of his life, was great, and from him, no doubt,

¹⁾ *Dramatic works of Philip Massinger*, in 4 vols. complete. Revised and corrected with notes critical and explanatory by J. Monck Mason and a short essay on the life and writings of Massinger (by J. Davies). London 1779. This essay of Davies was first printed separately in 12° form. Also prefixed to Coxeter's edition in 1761, for which it appears to have been written.

²⁾ Among other cases already mentioned, there is a letter of the Earl of Pembroke to Lord Burghley written 1589, in which he says, 'Having occasion to send my servant Massinger to London, I have willed him to impart to you matters which much concern me'.

expected that patronage which would be necessary to the completion of his son's education. Having a culture not universally possessed by all gentlemen of that age, and appreciating the value of knowledge, he wished to have his son receive the education necessary to him as a gentleman. Just before and at young Massinger's birth appeared the first gleams of one of the most brilliant days ever recorded in the history of the human mind. His father could scarcely have foreseen the brilliancy of the day, but to an attentive observer the signs which heralded its coming were plentiful. As shown above, our poet's father had been often to the Court of Queen Elisabeth. The Court of the Virgin Queen was, even in that day, compared to a school-room. 'The stranger, that entereth in the Court of England upon the sudden, shall rather imagine himself to come into some public school of the University than into a Prince's Palace'.¹⁾ There he must have seen that the disparity between soldier and scholar was gradually disappearing. Sir Philip Sidney, whom he knew, united both in high degree. The Queen was not only a great lover of learning, but was herself, according to the standard of that age, a great scholar.

The mastery of mind was beginning to assert its supremacy. The master was to be no more subservient to the inferior.

The first authentic account we have of the young bard after his birth, is his matriculation²⁾ at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. We have not even a record of his baptism. Before Gifford, and under his direction, the books of all the churches in which he could have been baptized were searched for the record. The search was fruitless. The best explanation which has been offered of this fact, which would otherwise appear singular enough, is that of Col. Cunningham³⁾, who says that St. Edmund 'one of the principle of them fell down in 1653', and as 'there is a vacuum in its registers extending over the

¹⁾ Harrison, *Description of Britain*. Book II. chap. 15. Quoted in Hume's History of England. Appendix III.

²⁾ Phillipus Massinger, Sarisburiensis, generosi filius, nat. an. 18.

³⁾ *The Plays of Philip Massinger*, from the text of William Gifford, with the addition of the Tragedy, 'Believe as you list' ed. by Lt. Col. Cunningham. London 1867.

period in which the name might have appeared, it is probable that the infant son of Arthur Massinger received the name of Philip at the font of St. Edmund's.' This baptism, according to an old authority¹⁾, must have been within a month after his birth. Hartley Coleridge²⁾ indulges the 'pleasing fancy' that Massinger had as sponsor the brother of Lady Pembroke, Sir Philip Sidney. It is indeed pleasing but it will probably never be known with certainty, if such was the case or not. We do not know the month in which the poet was born, and cannot determine if Sir Philip was at Wilton during that time. If so, it is probable that he stood sponsor to Massinger. The assumption that he was sponsor to Philip presupposes a great degree of intimacy with Arthur Massinger. In the letter quoted above, which is addressed to Sir Philip 'our Mr. Massinger' is spoken of as a friend well known to the former, and the relation of Arthur Massinger to the Herbert family gives the supposition an air of strong probability. He met Sir Philip often on his frequent and sometimes protracted visits to Lady Pembroke. Under the supposition that he was not sponsor for Massinger, the fact that he bore the same name is peculiar. Philip Herbert, younger son of Earl Pembroke, and in later years the patron of the poet, was born the year before, in 1583, and had for sponsor his uncle Sir Philip. The fact bearing most strongly against the 'fancy' is this, that Massinger, having the same name as Philip Herbert, and from the same illustrious personage, does not mention the fact in the dedication of '*The Bondman*', where he sums up rather modestly the claims which he has upon the bounty and generosity of the Lord, or what was the same thing in those days, where he advances the reasons why he dedicates to him this drama. It was scarcely a fact which Massinger would have neglected, but one of which he would have been proud. The only explanation of this, if the supposition be true, which appears tenable, is that Massinger, having become a Roman Catholic,

¹⁾ *Manners and customs of the Inhabitants of England*, by Joseph Strutt. 3 vols. London 1776. vol I. p. 77. 'A child within 30 nights (after its birth) shall be baptized'.

²⁾ *The Dramatic Works of Massinger and Ford*, with an introduction by Hartley Coleridge, London. 1840. Introduction p. XXVIII.

would not have recalled to Philip Herbert's or anyone's mind, the fact that he had received his name from one, who was so bitter an enemy of Catholicism, and so inveterate in his dislike of members of that Faith. It may be said, that on the same hypothesis, he would not have applied for assistance to one who was himself a Protestant, and brother to an enemy of the Catholic faith, as bitter as Sir Philip himself. But Philip Herbert was no bigot, and in truth had no great reverence for any Creed. Besides that, we know Massinger did receive assistance from other Protestants. Such are the different lights in which the conjecture of Coleridge may be viewed, and there the matter must rest, until some evidence be found which shall settle the question. An authoritative conclusion can not be reached from the material which we now have.

The next point for consideration is the youth of the poet. In treating of this, we find ourselves in a 'sea of uncertainty', and every one is free to give rein to his imagination, by which one is likely to arrive at results of more interest than truth. When one is unwilling to deal in vain conjectures, one may still group together certain known events, which may serve to throw some light upon the youth of our poet. Part of this time of his life he spent at Wilton, part in London. We know him to have been in London, during the winters of 1594, 1596 and 1599, those being the dates of the baptism of three of his sisters.¹⁾ What times he was there besides we know not. In Wilton, he was surrounded by a circle of wit, elegance and learning not common to those days. Col. Cunningham suggests that in that place, if anywhere, 'he would learn to admire the combination of rank and power, and stately yet flowing courtesy, which in after life he was so fond of bestowing upon his favourite characters'. Lady Pembroke, the subject of Jonson's celebrated Epitaph, is described by Walpole²⁾ as a liberal patroness to men of learning and a

¹⁾ *The New-England Historical and Genealogical Register* etc. vol. XIV. Boston 1860. p. 75 (Geo. W. Messinger). Mr. Messinger gives several extracts from the Records of the Church of St. Dunstan in the West, London; among others, the entries of the baptism of three daughters of 'Arthur Messenger, Esquier'.

²⁾ *Royal and noble Authors*, by Horatio Walpole. Enlarged etc. by Park. 2 vols. London 1706. vol. II. p. 249.

poetical translator and composer of poetry which did her credit. Sir Philip Sidney, as mentioned above, was often at Wilton, and wrote the larger part of the '*Arcadia*' there. These were the two figures, around which a large circle of literary celebrities grouped themselves. Sir Philip died shortly after Massinger's birth, but Lady Pembroke ever liked to collect around her men of genius, who were delighted to find with her that appreciation which was not universally accorded them by the world.

Col. Cunningham conjectures that Massinger was a page of the Countess as 'his allusions to the position and minute duties of a page are perpetual'.

It were idle to try to arrive at any definite conclusion as to who instructed Massinger in his youth. He might have been taught by some one of the *littérateurs*, above mentioned; as for example the poet Daniel. He could not have been instructed by the tutors of the young Herberts, as they were at Oxford already in 1592, respectively thirteen and nine years of age. He might have been taught the rudiments by the Countess. He might have gone to school at Salisbury. What appears most probable is, that he might have been instructed by his father. We know nothing, except that he did receive instruction, and this we know because he went to Oxford.

Massinger was matriculated in the year 1602 at St. Alban's Hall, as a citizen of Salisbury, and son of a gentleman.¹⁾ From the time he went to Oxford, little is known of him until many years after. Wood says that while at Oxford 'he applied himself more to poetry and romances than to logic and philosophy, which he ought to have done, and for that end was patronized'.²⁾ Langbaine, an authority equally good, or better, says he closely pursued his studies in St. Alban's Hall for three or four years.³⁾ Oldys, who has corrected many mistakes of Langbaine, makes no note upon this passage, and and it follows, he agrees with him. Gifford also follows the authority of Langbaine and remarks 'he must have applied

¹⁾ Cf. p. 7 Note 2.

²⁾ *Ath. Ox.* vol. III. p. 655.

³⁾ *Ibid.* vol. III. p. 352.



himself to study with uncommon energy, for his literary acquisitions at this early period appear to have been multifarious and extensive'.¹⁾ In this case, one might hesitate to adopt unreservedly the opinion of either Wood or Langbaine. I have attempted to prove above that Wood is no authority who may be implicitly followed. A student of Massinger's works will soon discover that he was a scholar of classical attainments, and he uses his knowledge with the freedom of a master, never with the hesitancy of a pupil. His exposition of a line of thought is clear vigorous and logical. The philosophy of the noblest kind to which Gifford alludes is a peculiar trait of all on which Massinger has laid his refining and chastening hand. He was a born poet, but he has the elegance and polish of a made poet. His rhetorical powers, his 'harmonious swell of numbers', the full rounding of his mouth-filling periods, and the artistic concealment of the underlying effort, are praised with one accord by all dramatic critics; even by Hazlitt. No one can doubt that Massinger was a student. Langbaine states clearly that he applied himself closely to his studies. But the authority of Wood may not be entirely neglected. On the authority of Langbaine, we can logically refuse to believe that Massinger neglected 'logic and philosophy'; we may yet believe with Wood that he devoted himself to 'poetry and romances', which, as his after life demonstrates, and contrary to the authority of Wood he ought to have done'.

After Massinger had spent several years at Oxford, he left 'without the honour of a degree'. Several reasons have been assigned for this departure without a degree. One fact we know. Massinger left Oxford under no disgraceful circumstances, else there would be some record of it in the Archives of the University. Our explanation then must begin

¹⁾ Introduction p. VI. Col. Cunningham here retorts upon Gifford and asks what evidence he gave of these acquisitions, what works he produced at this period, whereas Gifford had given or rather implied his grounds for this assertion, where he says Massinger's reasoning will not be found deficient either in method or effect, and it might easily be proved that he was no mean proficient in philosophy of the noblest kind. Wood also says 'At length, being sufficiently famed for several species of wit, he wrote divers comedies and tragedies'.

with two facts: that he left Oxford without the honour of a degree, and under no disgraceful circumstances.

Sir Henry Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, father of William and Philip, and patron lord of Arthur Massinger, died Jan. 19th 1601. Massinger went to Oxford a year and three months after the death of Earl Henry. Hence Massinger, being dependent upon the Herbert family, must have been supported at Oxford, either by some member of that family or by his father. If Massinger had been page to the Lady Pembroke, we might expect she would have continued the regard she bore Massinger in his youth to his maturer years. But among the papers¹⁾ already referred to, we find a letter which says 'The Earl of Pembroke is dead, bestowing all upon the young Lord even his wife's jewels, and leaving her as bare as he could'. Young Philip Herbert, during the time Massinger was at Oxford, and even after he left, was a 'wild young nobleman', of very extravagant mode of life, who was often compelled to accept the assistance of his brother.²⁾ Wood³⁾ says of him, he pretended to no other qualification, than to understand horses and dogs very well. He was too young, at all events, to be of any assistance to the poet, whom he had forgotten, or at most but dimly recollected, as he had not had the opportunity of seeing Massinger often, and then perhaps only on flying-visits to Wilton. Thus Massinger must have been supported at Oxford by Earl William or his father. Clarendon⁴⁾, in his description of the character of Earl Pembroke, speaks of him as 'most universally beloved and esteemed of any man of his time of a pleasant and facetious humour and a disposition affable generous and munificent but was still ready to promote the pretences of the worthy He was a great lover of his country and of the religion and justice which he believed could only support it; and his friendships were only with men of those

¹⁾ *Calendar of State Papers. Domestic Series, Green 1598—1601.* London 1869. p. 544.

²⁾ *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, by Edward Earl of Clarendon. 3 vols. Oxford 1702. vol. I. Fol. Edition. p. 46—7.

³⁾ *Ath. Ox.* vol. II. p. 483.

⁴⁾ *History of the Rebellion.* vol. I. p. 44—6.

principles He died exceedingly lamented by men of all qualities, and left many of his servants and dependents owners of good estates raised out of his employments and bounty etc.' Wood¹⁾ speaks of him not only as being a great favourer of the learned and ingenious, but also as being himself learned, and in numerous allusions to him, always mentions him with respect and admiration. Such was the character of the young Earl. Truly deserving of admiration and one to whom Arthur Massinger would naturally look for the maintainance of his son at Oxford. Massinger had the highest claims upon his bounty, and the Earl being such as he was, would be the first to acknowledge those claims, unless sufficient reasons justified him in withholding it. Pecuniary considerations had no influence upon his conduct. He sought no occasion to evade to those claims upon his kindness. The cause of its withdrawal must be sought in Massinger himself. If it was extended, we know it was not continued. Gifford²⁾ wonders why the Earl of Pembroke, being such as described above should neglect a young man, to whom his assistance was so necessary; especially since Massinger not only deserved this assistance, but had strong claims upon it. 'That he was never indebted to it is, I fear, indisputable; since the poet, of whose character gratitude forms a striking part, while he recurs perpetually to his hereditary obligations to the Herbert family, anxiously avoids all mention of William's name. I sometimes indeed imagine that I have discovered the cause of this alienation, but cannot flatter myself that it will be very generally, or even partially allowed'. Gifford then goes on to say he attributes it to Massinger having changed, during his stay at Oxford, his father's religion for one at that time 'the object of persecution hatred and terror'. 'That is, Massinger while at Oxford had become a Roman Catholic.' There are facts which may be adduced to make this conjecture, if not a certainty, at least such a strong probability, as that few candid minds will reject it.

Wood says he was encouraged and patronized in his

¹⁾ *Ath. Ox.* vol. II. p. 484. In this article, Wood speaks of the year 1592 as the one in which the young Herberts went to Oxford.

²⁾ Introduction p. VIII—IX.

studies by the Earl of Pembroke. Langbaine says his father bestowed a liberal education upon our author. The two accounts conflict, yet there is truth in both of them. The Earl of Pembroke sent Massinger to Oxford, who being the son of one of his own gentlemen, who had served so long with his father, deserved it. The latter changed his religion while at Oxford, and became Catholic; as Gifford conjectures, 'during his residence at the University'. By this change, he lost the favour and patronage of the Earl. After withdrawal of the Earl's support and countenance, Massinger was left dependent upon what little he had received from his father, upon the death of the latter, who died in 1603. Wood's remark applies to the first term of Massinger's stay at Oxford, that of Langbaine to the last, and Gifford's to the intermediate. It stands between the two, explains them both, and demonstrates its own truth at the same time. Another proof of the truth of his having become Catholic is, that all objections, which have been brought against the conjecture, can either be clearly explained, or tend to strengthen the assumption of its truth. Col. Cunningham¹⁾ admits the absence of patronage, but denies the probability of the change, and says even admitting the change, the neglect of the Earl could not be accounted for on that ground. To prove this position, he refers to the latter part of the paragraph from Clarendon, quoted above. Clarendon, after having mentioned the virtues of the Earl, says his vices must not be past over in silence. 'He indulged to himself the pleasures of all kinds in almost all excesses. To women he was immoderately given up'. Looking at this darker side of the Earl's character from our standpoint, and judging him before the tribunal of the ideas of right and wrong of the 19th century, we might agree that, being of such a character, he would not necessarily be so 'strait-laced' as to transfer the distrust and dislike he bore a class, as a class, to an individual of that class. But we must

¹⁾ Introduction p. VIII.—XI. After quoting Clarendon's remark, that 'he was clouded by great infirmities, which he had in too exorbitant proportion: he indulged himself ' he goes on to say, 'For such an one to have been as strait-laced as Gifford's theory seems to require is to anticipate the pious fears of Goldsmith's soldier, in the exquisite dialogue in *the Citizen of the World*.

bear in mind that the principles of action in those days were confined to a few deep thinkers, and that that class of society of which Earl William was a member was in the highest degree dissolute, and laid no restraint upon their appetites and desires. It was not considered a sin to indulge in such excesses. In many instances it was deemed a folly, or a fault worthy of condemnation and reproof, but never of punishment. A person could be very profligate, and yet a very good Christian. How many men of lewd lives died in those days for their religion!

Clarendon calls the gratifications in which the Earl indulged himself vices, but he was one of the deep thinkers, and himself was one who assisted in raising the moral standard of his time. Besides that, even he speaks very leniently of them. He seems to consider the graver fault his having given himself up to these pleasures immoderately and praised the fine delicacy and nice taste he evinced in selecting the ladies of his love. Thus a man could be very strict in one point of morality, very free in what we consider another, and yet in the eyes of the people be very consistent, or entirely pardonable. At that time, the Roman Catholics were held in great distrust, and after the accession of James I., this fear and hatred were in no wise decreased; rather augmented. The Earl of Pembroke, as a statesman and man of large parts, conversant with the state of the kingdom, the condition of the government, and sentiments of the people, could see the danger which was threatened the peace, and some then thought the safety and prosperity of the country by the Roman Catholics. Such at least were the views of the Protestants of that day; much more would such be the opinion of one, who was the nephew of Sir Philip Sidney, the son of his sister, and who had attracted the attention of Queen Elisabeth herself at a very early age, as we see from a letter¹⁾ written by the Earl Henry to Her Majesty, thanking her for her 'gracious

¹⁾ *Calendar of State Papers. Domestic Series. Green 1598—1601.* London 1869. Written at Wilton, Sept. 19th 1599 'I am exceedingly comforted with your gracious opinion of my son, which in your letters to me not long since you expressed, and with his own joyful acknowledgement of your favour'

opinion' of his son. Such would have been the opinion of any Protestant against any Catholic. How much more would it be the opinion of one, who at an early age, had written an answer to the ten reasons of Campion the Jesuit, and had even dedicated it to the Queen.¹⁾ When in addition to this, we consider that Massinger was the son of his father's trusted retainer, had been raised up under the eyes of his mother, had possibly received his name from his own uncle, Sir Philip Sidney, was sent to Oxford at his own expense, and that Massinger had under such circumstances become one of a hatred sect, and that knowing it was hateful to him, it makes it apparently very clear that he 'was' so 'strait-laced', and it must be confessed justly so. That he did not continue his patronage, is natural. Clarendon says expressly that he was a great lover of his country and of the religion and justice which he believed could only support it; and his friendships were only with men of those principles. Col. Cunningham's explanation that it was Puritanism not Roman Catholicism, that was running in the chancellor's head when he wrote these lines, is an assertion, not an argument: it is well known that the division between the Churchmen and the Puritans had not yet become so wide as to cause uneasiness among those higher classes of Church and State against which their efforts were directed. The Earl of Pembroke disliked politically those agitators who afterwards set at open defiance both the laws and creeds to which he was himself pledged, but he hated, deeply as Sir Philip Sidney himself, the detested Catholics. Col. Cunningham suggests as another ground against this change of creed, the fact that Wood does not mention it, of which he must have heard, had it taken place, and which would have been of 'particular interest to old Anthony, as he was himself again and again accused of exhibiting in his writings a strong leaning to Papists, and all who were papis-

¹⁾ In the Lansdowne Collection of MSS. British Museum, 97—7. This treatise is written in Latin. It substantiates Wood's assertion that he was himself learned. It bears the title in Latin: '*Ad Campionem eiusque decem rationes responsio*'. Some one has written in pencil upon the fly-leaf of this tract or disquisition '1581'. This is impossible as Sir William Herbert was born in 1582. Written perhaps sometime after 1600.

tically inclined'. 'So much the worse for' — Wood, if he does not mention it. That one who made a mistake 'where it required so little pains to be accurate' as Gifford¹⁾ says, speaking of Wood's mistake regarding the year of Massinger's matriculation, should also not have heard of his becoming Catholic, is easily understood. That Wood leaned to Papists or those papistically inclined, is a matter still open for dispute. He died in the communion of the Church of England.²⁾ The fact that Oxford was a University always more Catholic than Protestant',³⁾ is an argument for the change. Gifford mentions another fact which has strong leaning upon the case. Massinger's most intimate friends were Catholics. Gifford⁴⁾ has given the name of several who were Catholics. One very important one he has overlooked: James Shirley, his most intimate literary friend after Fletcher's death; also a dramatist, whom Wood accurately stiles 'the most noted dramatist of his time'.

It has often been remarked that no writer of that period is so free from impiety as Massinger, and none who has such respect for morality. Whether this may be adduced as proof, is open for doubt. Some things would seem to justify it. Massinger was too pure in the practice of his principles to allow him to ridicule that Faith, which he himself professed, to caricature its Form of Worship, or sneer at the infirmities and sins of its members. Being a Roman Catholic writer, he could only satirize the Reformers and Protestants. It can easily be seen with what danger that was attended at that time, especially from a Roman Catholic writer. Those are the arguments and proofs which tend to establish the change of creed as a fact, without considering that which first suggested the idea to Gifford. He based this conjecture on internal evidence, which he found in some of Massinger's plays.⁵⁾

¹⁾ Introduction p. VI.

²⁾ He professed to do so in his will prefixed to *Ath. Ox.* Ed. Bliss.

³⁾ Introduction p. XXX. Coleridge.

⁴⁾ Introduction p. XXXVI., note. Gifford says, after enumerating several instances 'I will not take upon myself to say that this community of Faith strengthened their mutual attachment, though I do not think it altogether improbable'.

⁵⁾ 'A close and repeated perusal of Massinger's works has convinced me that he was a Catholic. *The Virgin Martyr, The Rene-*

Coleridge¹⁾ differs from Gifford on this point, and devotes a long note of nearly five pages to the investigation of the 'innumerable' proofs that Massinger was a 'Roman' Catholic. By the emphasis laid upon 'innumerable' and 'Roman', he tacitly admits that there are some proofs he became a Catholic, if not a Roman Catholic. Gifford, speaking of Massinger having become a Roman Catholic, had in mind no nice distinction between Catholicism, as Protestants use the word in its more general meaning, and Roman Catholicism, or of what Coleridge speaks as being synonymous, Popery. He says Massinger had become a Roman Catholic, and had changed from Protestantism, using Roman Catholic as the opposite to Protestant. To give a synopsis of Coleridge's investigation of 'these three plays — *The Virgin Martyr*, *The Renegado* and *The Maid of Honour*': 'It is not known, he says²⁾, which of them selected the story, or whether either of them chose it at all', which of course is utterly immaterial. It may be admitted for the sake of his arguments, that that one chose it, the fact of whose having chosen it would argue against the change. Be it 'the refaciamento of an older play, borrowed from the work of some foreign dramatist, or founded on one of the so-called mysteries', Massinger, the disgusting obscenity excepted, wrote most of the play, and by publishing it under his name, indicated that what therein was, was begotten by him, and that he was jointly responsible for it. Had he been opposed to anything in the drama, he would not have let it be published. Let the source be what it may, Massinger made use of the source. Coleridge then gives an outline of the drama, or turns it into narrative. Of the narrative he says, it is monastic enough in taste and feeling, but has nothing peculiarly Popish or even Romish. He thinks 'the extraordinary worship passionate seeking after martyrdom, not as a duty, but as a

gado, *The Maid of Honour*' exhibit innumerable proofs of it.' Introduction p. VI.

¹⁾ Introduction p. XXXI—VI.

²⁾ Speaking of '*The Virgin Martyr*'. Massinger and Decker were joint authors of this play, though it has been generally allowed that Decker's share was the smaller. *Hircius* and *Spungius* are considered exclusively his, much to the honour of Massinger. Gifford was able to detect his hand in few other parts of the play.

merit and an especial mark of favour cannot be identified with Romanism or Catholicism. They are rather patristic than popish'. Celibacy and virginity were also in those days praised by those who were married. 'Other Legends quite as marvellous are alluded to by some of our soundest divines with apparent Faith. The marvellous efficacy ascribed to the cruciform figure is the nearest approach to Popery in *'The Virgin Martyrs, The Renegado'* Coleridge admits 'is decidedly Italian and decidedly popish.' He gives the narrative and speaks of 'Father Francisco, the Jesuit, whose power of conversion is nothing short of miraculous'. 'Massinger must have been a bold man, or confident of protection in some quarter, to represent in such fair colours an order (i. e. the Jesuits) abhorred and dreaded like witchcraft.' Of some scenes he remarks, 'this is very popish, and very patristic and very puritanical.' Speaking of the baptism being actually performed upon the stage, he observes 'Massinger plainly asserts baptismal regeneration.' Of what Donusa says after being baptized he says 'I do not think that this can be orthodox catholicism, either at Rome or anywhere else. Validity of lay-baptism is allowed by the church of Rome in extreme cases. In fine the *Renegado* is a monkish story, dramatised by the faith of the imagination; whether with the faith of the heart, I leave for the reader's decision'. Of *'The Maid of Honour'*: 'its religion is the religion of knighthood and la belle science, not of the cloister nor the Vatican. Except that the heroine turns nun, it furnishes no proof of Massinger's recusancy. One fine passage indeed, proves, if anything, that he was not a Papist:

'When what is vowed to Heaven is dispensed with
To serve our private ends, a curse must follow
And not a blessing.'

Now here is a plain denial of the Pope's prerogative'.

The above is a résumé of all Coleridge says in his investigation, which is pertinent to the question, the greater part of which is not. As far as possible, his own words have been used. All this says nothing at all against the change, and a still greater is neither for nor against it. The result which he reaches, the confessed result, substantiates what Gifford says, that Massinger had become Roman Catholic. His conclusion to 'this long inquiry' is the best comment

which can be made on his own investigation and against his position; he is forced by his results to make a compromise, that Massinger merely became a Catholic, which is all Gifford assumed, and all which has been contended for here. His remark that 'nothing can be concluded from this long inquiry except that Massinger was no enemy to the 'Unreformed Church', is unfair proceeding against his conclusions. But it is high time to conclude this long inquiry, from which, after all, nothing can be concluded, but that Massinger had no abhorrence of the ceremonies, institutions or devotional affections of the unreformed church. He probably went as near Rome as his reason would permit him; but there is no proof that he ever renounced the English Communion: and I am confident he was no Papist, no priest-ridden slave, never believed that any priest or bishop could reverse the immutable laws of right or wrong, dispense with the duties of children and parents, husbands and wives, subjects, insert or blot out a name in the book of life. Superstitious he might be; most men of genius etc. etc. Fanatic or bigot, Massinger was not'. To say we have no proof that Massinger ever renounced the 'English Communion' is equivalent to saying we have no proofs that he became Catholic. We have no record of the change, but the strongest circumstantial evidence that he had renounced the Communion of the Church of England: the evidence which is to be found out side of Massinger's works, and which has been given here; the internal evidence which produced conviction in Gifford's mind¹⁾, and which Coleridge's 'long inquiry' but renders more palpable. Either internal or external evidence would be all but conclusive. Together they are — decisive!

After Massinger became Catholic, it was but natural that the young Earl of Pembroke withdrew his support. It seemed under the circumstances, almost an open defiance.

The exact length of Massinger's stay at the University is uncertain. Langbaine says 'three or four years', Wood, 'four

¹⁾ Another proof of the strength of the internal evidence is the fact that it also produced conviction in Mr. Ward's mind, before he had read Gifford, as he tells us in his admirable and thorough '*History of English Dramatic Literature*'. London 1875. 2 vols.

or more'. Following the authority of both, I should adopt four years as the length of his stay. The grounds which have been assigned for his leaving and going to London are various. Gifford says he was compelled to leave by the death of his father. If Massinger staid four years at Oxford, this could not have been the case, for 'Arthur Massinger Gent.' was buried in the church of St. Dunstan in the West, London, the 4th day of June 1603. He must have been supported, after his rupture with the Earl, by what his father had left him. Having indulged his liking for poetry and romances too much, he left without the honour of a degree, to the great indignation of Anthony a Wood. Wood makes this statement so that it leaves upon one's mind the impression that he received no degree, because he was so devoted to poetry as entirely to neglect his other studies. Gifford is unwilling to think that Massinger was unable to get a degree from want of talent or application.¹⁾ Want of talent can not be alleged against him. Want of application to logic and philosophy is scarcely a crime in one who was born to write poetry; at least to such logic and philosophy as Wood meant. Four years as Gifford says, might be sufficient to fill 'even an ordinary mind' with logic and philosophy enough to pass the examination, but in the case of even an extraordinary mind, the four years should be devoted to the study of those branches necessary to the examination. It would seem that Massinger did not get his degree because he had not devoted enough time to logic and philosophy, but as mentioned above, had applied himself much to literature.

The money his father had left him having been exhausted, or the patronage of the Earl being withdrawn, he was compelled to leave. Hence when about 22 years of age, he was without support, and without hope of assistance from anyother than himself. It was useless to return to Salisbury. He

¹⁾ 'A shorter period, however, than four years, would be found amply sufficient to furnish even an ordinary mind with enough of school logick and philosophy to pass the examination of a bachelor's degree; and I am, therefore, unwilling to believe that Massinger missed it on the score of incapacity in these notable arts.' — Introduction p. VII.

naturally turned his thoughts towards London, where he had a mother and several young sisters dependent upon him. At that time more than ever before was London becoming the center of the life of England. It was gradually becoming what it has become. Then as now, it was to the unsophisticated the city of bright dreams, the embodiment of air castles, the city of the 'Streets of Gold'. In London could mediocrity soonest support itself, talent most easily attract attention, genius most readily be appreciated, sought out, taken by the hand, and led upon the Rostrum of Great Intellectuals.¹⁾ Massinger was young, and no doubt, as such, ardent. His works prove him to have been high-souled, manly independent sensitive and proud. He had lofty ideas of life, and had just yielded up his physical to what he considered his spiritual welfare. At the turning point of his life, he had turned to poetry and romance as his most congenial element. From 1550 to 1650 rose the English Poetry to its height. The English Dramatic Poetry was beginning to take its first grand flight in Marlowe, Greene, Peele and Shakespeare, both before Massinger went to Oxford, and while he was there. Chaucer must have fallen into his hands. Spenser had published the first three books of his *Faerie Queene* so early as 1590. From 1590 to 1600 many of the plays of Peele, Greene and Marlowe had been published. Some acted earlier with tremendous applause. '*Much Ado about nothing*' appeared in 1600. '*Midsummernight's Dream*' in 1600; from 1594 to 1600 were published the '*Henry Dramas*'. '*Romeo and Juliet*' in 1597. '*Hamlet*' in 1603, while Massinger was still at Oxford! Other works of note had appeared, were appearing. It was a time of political calm: a dead calm which seemed to presage the storm which followed under Charles I. Intellect, so long dormant, was beginning to heave itself in heavy majestic surges. London was the center of this activity. The grand successes and triumphs of mind attracted the attention of all England. The true spirit of dramatic poetry especially was rising to a per-

¹⁾ 'Genug — wer empor kommen wollte, musste unbedingt nach London gehen.' Karl Elze, *William Shakespeare*. Halle 1876, p. 156. in speaking of literature and poetry.

fection never dreamed of since the days of Grecian purity: a perfection whose exponent was Shakespeare. The works which were published at that time, many of which are to this day 'hoarded household works', must have fallen into Massinger's hands. They were accessible to all, much more so to one so devoted to literature as the young poet then, as it were, rocked in the cradle of the Muses. It may have been a matter of much disgust to the learned professors that a young student should prefer conning over the leaves of a last new play such as '*Hamlet*', to attending to their philosophical expositions of scholastic subtleties, and disquisitions on the pedestrian capability of angels. To the Epicurean palate of learning, nothing which lacked the savour of antiquity was delectable. *Hamlet*, smacking of newness, with a homely flavour, having no prototype in Grecian or Roman literature, was insipid, weak. Such were the men of learning, under whom Massinger studied: men who looked with suspicion and distrust upon the restlessly active and innovating struggles of the Mind, which was freeing itself from the bondage of former ignorance and superstition. They did not appreciate the mental craving after something higher and purer than that they already had. They still heaped the incense of their adoration upon the shrines of antiquity. They, the old school, clung with reverence to their ancient forms and ceremonies: the new school looked with contempt upon forms which had lost their truth, ceremonies which had lost their meaning. They demanded Truth, they trusted to Intellect; they revered Reason. They were not content to stand still, and while the school of such as James I. looked on with piteous astonishment and fear as they plunged boldly forward, they advanced stoutly onward to the Great Rebellion, the Revolution, the Protestant succession, the war of Independence; to the discoveries and developments of modern Science, the dissemination of modern learning, and the distribution of modern wealth. Massinger was educated under men of the old school and to them was indebted for the preparation for those efforts of genius, the fruits of which we still enjoy. The hurtful influence which they might have exerted on him fell harmlessly from him. The good fell upon fruitful soil, took root, flourished and blossomed into flowers of poetry and truth. Devoted to poetry he

must have read that poetry which was making a new epoch. It served to fan the secret fires. He appreciated the poetry, and felt his own spirit rise and expand as it was breathed upon by the divine efflatus of mighty minds. He must have seen their defects and in measuring his own feeling of power against their real strength, he felt that he was inferior to none, superior to most. The new school of dramatic art which was beginning had retained enough of the old to be profane without being reverent, and the people retained enough partiality for the old, to require that the new school be 'interlarded with buffoonery', trivial profanity, and many specimens of low wit, which they could readily grasp. It cannot be doubted that Massinger was repelled by their coarseness, but he appreciated the great and the good in their efforts, and it settled his destiny in life. His father died and was buried in London. He had a mother and several sisters there who were most likely dependent upon him. If he wished to dedicate himself to a literary career, he must go to London and thus in 1606 he went. Having been born under the most favourable auspices, raised up in the most delightful and brilliant surroundings, among high-minded and refined society, educated at Oxford itself, his advantages in youth were such as few enjoyed in those days. However flattering may have been his beginning, his life was one long battle for existence. At 22 years of age, he was cast upon his own resources, which were pitifully small, to begin the struggle of life with the struggle for bread, destined never to intermit the one, never to enjoy plenteousness of the other. He attained eminence and popularity, and never enjoyed more than enough to live with strict economy, in his most affluent circumstances. In his literary youth, from the time he went to London until 1622, when we first find his name recorded as a dramatist, we have no direct evidence or rather proof of what he was doing, except that he was engaged in writing in conjunction with other poets. His collaboration with Fletcher has been placed beyond doubt. It is mentioned by his 'worthy friend' Sir Aston Cockayne in three distinct places, and in another we have Massinger's own testimony for the truth of this fact. It is the so-called tripartite letter. Mr. Malone 'dragged it from the dust of Dulwich College'. Gifford was the first to use it,

and it is here transcribed from him.¹⁾ It is a letter written by Field Daborne and Massinger to Hinchlow (or Henslow) requesting money to release them from prison, where they were confined for debt.

To our most loving friend, Mr. Philip Hinchlow, Esquire, These,
Mr. Hinchlow

You understand our unfortunate extremity, and I do not think you so void of Christianity but that you would throw so much money into the Thames as we request now of you, rather than endanger so many innocent lives. You know there is XL. more at least to be received of you for the play. We desire you to lend us VL. of that, which shall be allowed to you; without which we cannot be bailed, nor I play anymore till this be dispatched. It will lose you XXL. ere the end of the next week, besides the hinderance of the next new play. Pray, Sir, consider our cases with humanity, and now give us cause to acknowledge you our true friend in time of need. We have entreated Mr. Davison to deliver this note, as well to witness your love as our promises and always acknowledgement to be ever.

Your most thankful and loving friends

Nat. Field.

The money shall be abated out of the money remains for the play of Mr. Fletcher and ours.

Rob. Daborne.

I have ever found you a true and loving friend to me, and in so small a suite, it being honest I hope you will not fail us.

Philip Massinger.²⁾

We find from the endorsement of the above celebrated 'tripartite letter', that Mr. Hinchlow was good enough to lend them a part of the money he owed them.

This letter, which in some respects is so inexplicable, is very valuable, as it settles the spelling of Massinger's name, which before Gifford, was often spelt Messenger; it settles the fact, or rather leads us to suspect that Massinger had assisted Fletcher in writing plays; it gives us an idea of the terrible

¹⁾ Introduction p. XV. This letter is also given in the '*Historical Account*' prefixed to Malone's *Shakespeare*, where it was first published. Also accurately copied, with original bad spelling, in Colliers '*New Facts*'.

²⁾ Gifford, in copying this letter, has retained a part of the old spelling, but the larger part he has modernized. The reason is not very apparent why he did not modernize the whole. E. g. *doc* for *do*, *thincke* for *think*, *bayled* for *bailed*, *receaved* for *received* etc. etc. are some of the old forms which he retains.

poverty in which Massinger lived, when it required five pounds to release himself and his two friends, that is, less than five pounds to release himself alone from prison. His means must have been poor indeed if he was imprisoned for so small a sum. No date to this letter being given, we do not know when it was written. Mr. Hinchlow is said to have died in 1616. This letter then must have been written before that time. Col. Cunningham¹⁾ says 'the date of the tripartite letter is conjectured to be sometime in either 1613 or 1614'. From 1606 then until 1613 we see that Massinger was engaged in assisting other writers. It has often been strongly denied that the expression 'ours' included Massinger. If it rested alone upon the authority of this letter, it might still be a subject for doubt, whether Massinger had ever assisted Fletcher. The 'ours' here might include Field as well as Massinger, or it might include the former and not the latter. Fortunately, however, we have sufficient evidence to prove it meant Massinger: the authority of his intimate friend Sir Aston Cockayne in three several places, which does not and cannot bear other interpretation than that Massinger assisted Fletcher. First, he mentions it in a poem '*To the publishers of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher.*'²⁾ In this, he chides them for not specifying which plays were written by Fletcher, and which by Beaumont, as the main body of them was written by Fletcher, and there were only 'some' in which Beaumont assisted, not all. In addition to Fletcher's having been unjustly treated, he calls their attention to the fact that Massinger also had had a hand in some of the plays of their edition. He is merely complaining that Fletcher has not had justice done him. Beaumont's talents are not brought forward or spoken of derogatorily. Massinger's name is mentioned to show that not only had Fletcher been treated unjustly, but Massinger also. Fletcher had written the larger part, if not all, and injustice was done him by publishing the edition 'in Beaumonts and in Fletchers name'. He would say, if you wish to give Beau-

¹⁾ Introduction p. XII.

²⁾ Different renditions have been given of these lines, which are at first sight perhaps a little unintelligible. The writer hopes to have translated them into comprehensible prose.

mont so much credit for what little he has done in some of the plays, and for plays which he did not write, why have you not given Massinger his due, for both have written 'few', and Massinger as much as Beaumont.¹⁾

Much dispute has arisen as to who the bosom friend could be, who informed Sir Aston of these important facts. Gifford says Massinger's self was this friend. Those who differ from Gifford, simply record the fact that they do differ, or conjecture that it was Charles Cotton. That this could not be is proved by this, that Sir Aston makes the same statement of Massinger having assisted Fletcher, in a poem addressed to this same witty but obscene cousin. It will be seen that he does not make this assertion as if he had it from the person to whom the lines are addressed. He states it as something entirely new to his cousin. Massinger, as

¹⁾ The passage is given entire, accurately copied from the original, and with Sir Aston's own punctuation.

'In the large book of Playes you late did print
(In Beaumonts and in Fletchers name) why in't
Did you not justice? Give to each his due?
For Beaumont (in those many) writ in few:
And Massinger in other few; The Main
Being sole Issues of sweet Fletchers brain.
But how came I (you ask) so much to know?
Fletchers chief bosome-friend informed me so.
I'th 'next impression therefore justice do,
And print their old one's in one volume too:
For Beaumonts works & Fletchers should come forth
With all the right belonging to their worth.'

This is from Sir Aston Cockayne's '*Small Poems of Divers Sort*', London 1658 p. 217. In the collected edition of Sir Aston's works, printed 1662, the pages from 209 to 256 are numbered 109, 110, 111 etc. instead of 209, 210, 211 etc. 217 is therefore 117. Sir Aston's power of making rhymes, and counting syllables was of no small capacity. He published his '*Small Poems of Divers Sorts*' 1658, several plays at different times, and published the whole in a collected edition in 1662. This collected edition does not seem to have been reprinted, but merely rebound together, as most of the plays etc. have each a separate titlepage. *Obstinate Lady* (the hint of which he took from Massinger) had been printed 4° 1657, *Tragedy of Ovid* reprinted 1669.

Gifford remarks, would certainly have taken no pains to conceal a fact which did him so much honour.¹⁾

This evidence seems conclusive. In an epitaph upon Fletcher and Massinger he says 'plays they did write together, were great friends'. This places beyond doubt that they wrote together. Had not Sir Aston been confident of the truth of his assertion, he would not have mentioned it so often, nor would he have been guilty of the imprudence, not to say impudence, of publicly accusing the publishers of this oversight or fault, when they could so easily have confounded his attack. Massinger's collaboration with Fletcher is certain, but we do not, perhaps never shall know in what or to what extent.²⁾

- 1) 'I wonder (Cousin) that you would permit
So great an injury to Fletcher's wit
Your friend and old companion
.
Had Beaumont lived when this Edition came
Forth, and beheld his ever living name
Before Plays that he never writ, how he
Had frowned and blushed at such Impiety?
His own Renown no such Addition needs
To have a Fame sprung from another's deedes.
And my good friend Old Philip Massinger
With Fletcher writ in some that we see there.'

Small Poems etc. p. 91—92. Sir Aston also mentions Massinger's name in two other places; on p. 108—9. he says, speaking of the degeneracy of the times

'Shakespeare (most rich in humours) entertain
The crowded theatres with his happy vein.
D'Avenant and Massinger and Shirley then
Shall be cri'd up again for famous men.'

On p. 234 he says

'Donne, Suckling, Randolph, Drayton, Massinger,
Habbington, Sandys May my Acquaintance were.'

Sir Aston's way of rhyming Massinger's name reminds one very strongly of a popular American rhyme.

²⁾ *Beaumont and Fletcher's Works*. Weber. London 1812. Weber says: 'Massinger assisted in *The False One*, *Love's Pilgrimage*, *The Lover's Progress*, and *The Jeweller of Amsterdam* or *The Hague*.' This latter play was entered on the stationer books as being by Fletcher,

From Massinger's arrival in London, then, until 1622, we know only a few scanty facts. Gifford fills this vacuum by saying he was, as proved above, engaged in writing with other writers. 'His modesty, combined with the urgency of his wants, deterred him at first from attempting to write alone.' That Massinger was modest cannot be denied by one who has read his works and dedications, but it may be doubted if his modesty was of so much force in preventing him writing alone as the urgency of his wants. Massinger was poor, having to provide for others than himself, his mother and sisters, perhaps a wife, without patronage or hopes of assistance. His only dependence was his talents, and he had to be content at first with little, so he could gain that little surely and regularly. Fletcher's name was an assurance of at least moderate success, mostly brilliant. The amount which was received for the plays written together, was, it is to be hoped, shared equally between them. This however must have been a very precarious existence, especially for Massinger.

Our author was not only modest, but sensitive and proud. His pride may have been injured secretly by this necessary collaboration, but it was no doubt advantageous to him. He learned the technicalities of his art, and due observance to minor points, which he otherwise might have neglected. In other words, he learned the routine of his profession, for such it was. It is doubtless to this careful training when young, that the regularity of Massinger's plots are to be attributed. Another advantage which Massinger reaped from this collaboration is, that he was brought to the favourable notice of managers, actors and men of genius, by being introduced by Fletcher. During this time he was often in want. Living with strict economy he was yet imprisoned for debt; of one time we know, probably oftener. We have another document, penned in 1615, by which Robert Daborne and Philip Massinger bind themselves, to pay to Hinchlow 'the full and entire sum of three pounds of lawful money of Eng-

Field and Massinger, and has been supposed to be the one alluded to in the 'tripartite letter'. History of English Dramatic Literature, vol. II. p. 236.

land.¹⁾ Col. Cunningham, who first uses the letter and gives it in full, makes this appropriate comment upon it: 'When such uncommon pains are taken about so small a sum as three pounds, it is, I am afraid, evidence that the circumstances of the borrowers were such as to lead the lender to apprehend some difficulty in recovering his advance'. The poverty of the poet must have been great indeed! The dramatist of that age had, in many respects, an unenviable position. He could attain eminence, but a successful playwright was not then, as now, a personage who could obtain wealth as well as position. To be a professional writer at that time, one whose sustenance depended upon his pen, was not as now an honour. Playwriting was no disgrace and yet no gracing honour, when his necessity compelled him to be a professional play-wright. In other words, to be a celebrated poet was an honour, but to be dependent for bread upon literary talents, was no honour. Great noblemen were acknowledged by the world as persons of more importance than those, whose highest merits had been the producing of such plays as *'Hamlet, Every Man in his Humour* or *A new Way to pay old Debts*'. Dedications spoke of noblemen condescending to read such trifles. It was reserved to the afterworld to assign the true position to brilliant genius, and to appreciate those prophets of intellectual culture who were not appreciated in their own time. Massinger was one of the first geniuses. As a successful author, he was ever in want. As an unknown writer of detached scenes for Fletcher, the condition of himself and family must have been miserable. Besides the assistance he rendered Fletcher, he was, as we know, engaged in writing plays independently; or in reviving older ones. Gifford²⁾ has placed nine plays before *'The Virgin Martyr*'. Whether Fletcher

¹⁾ This letter was first printed by Collier in his *'New Facts'*. Elze, in speaking of Collier quotes, 'timeo Danaos et dona ferentes'.

²⁾ 'Four only of the plays named in Warburton's list occur in the office book of Sir Henry Herbert, which is continued up to the latest period of Massinger's life: it is, therefore, evident that they must have been written previous to its commencement: these, therefore, with *'The Old Law, The Virgin Martyr* together with *The Unnatural Combat* and *The Duke of Milan*', which are also unnoticed in it, will sufficiently fill up the time till 1622'. Introduction XX.

assisted Massinger in these is not known, but presumably not, as his name is not mentioned in connection with the latter. Our first real knowledge of Massinger as a dramatist begins in 1622. We have however a hint or so of him even earlier. *'The Womans Plot'* was acted at Court in 1621. The fact that this was acted at Court proves either that the Comedy had already been favourably received, or that Massinger was well known as a dramatist at that time. During the time preceding this, he no doubt made the acquaintance of most of his 'worthy friends', to whose kindness he was oft indebted for bread. The rest of Massinger's life is merely a history of his plays, or rather of the dates of their appearance. What we know beyond what has already been written applies equally to any time of his life, with few exceptions.

The number of Massinger's friends gives us an idea of what his character was. He appears to have been one who could excite friendship and regard, but it is to be doubted if it ever became enthusiasm. He was often attacked by 'Catos of the stage', and in the Epilogue to the *'Emperor of the East'* he complains of their delighting in misapplying whatever he might write. In each of the Epilogues *'The Guardian'* and *'The Emperor of the East'* he sends either an open or covert shaft at other writers who had handled him unfairly, and at the 'abler wits' who, he anticipates, intend to laugh at his performance. Massinger's struggle for life was severe, when blest with success! Affected by the envy, jealousy and petty strifes which distracted the literary circles of that time, it must have been truly wretched. Jonson and his opponents were engaged in their bitter strife. Decker stood at the head of the opponents. Massinger, having written with Decker, would naturally have sided with the enemies of Jonson, had he engaged in the contest. Gifford, in his *'Proofs of Jonson's Malignity'* has certainly demonstrated that Jonson was not so malicious as the world has been taught to believe, but there still appears to be no doubt that he was often very bitter. Massinger, in his dramas, leans much more toward Shakespeare than Jonson, and Jonson, it is probable, handled our Poet more roughly than he could Shakespeare. Besides this, Jonson was becoming old, when Massinger was at the height of his

popularity, and it were but natural that he should lay less restraint upon his sarcasm than formerly. 'Cato of the stage' is an appellation well suited to Jonson, and unless it was meant for him, we can form no idea for whom it was intended. Among other remarks which apply very accurately to Jonson, is one in the Prologue of *'The Bashful Lover'*; 'Let others, building on their merit say, You're in the wrong if you go not that way, Which they prescribe'. Besides these constant allusions to such abler wits which are to be found in Massinger's Prologues and Epilogues, all of which suit Jonson as we know him in his works, there is another fact which is very striking: Jonson, although he and Massinger were among the last survivors of the great school, never dedicates to the latter a line, an Epigram or an Ode in all of his works. The extent of this hostility and its nature, we do not know, but that it existed, can not be doubted. Besides this we have direct evidence that Massinger was engaged in the broils of those times. He is mentioned as taking part in an uproar among the poets and wits, and indeed against Jonson.

This scene is introduced in a Mock Romance¹⁾, in which a conflict arises among the poets in Hades. A disturbance threatens to ensue between Chaucer and Ben Jonson and Spencer. Shakespeare and Fletcher, surrounded by their Life-Guards viz.: Goffe, Massinger, Decker, Webster, Suckling, Cartwright, Carew etc. take part. It originates by Jonson 'vaunting himself the first and best of English Poets'. This points clearly to the fact that Massinger was engaged in these literary contentions. The above quoted Mock Romance shows that he was on the side of those opposed to Jonson. In some lines quoted by Langbaine, his name is again associated with that of the great poet.

¹⁾ Coleridge (Introduction p. XI. VIII.) complains of Gifford not mentioning the source from which he gets this Mock Romance. Gifford, when he first quotes it (Introduction, p. I. XII, note), speaks of it, as a Mock Romance, entitled *Wit and Fancy in a Maze or Don Zara del Fogo*. 12^{mo} 1656 (the knowledge of which was obligingly communicated to me by the Rev. W. Jodd.) It was also published in 1719 under the name of *The Spaniard or Don Zara del Fogo*. The above mentioned scene is to be found on page 72.

'Ingenious Shakespear, Massinger that knows
The strength of plot, to write in verse and prose,
Whose easy Pegasus will ramble o'er
Some three score miles of Fancy in an hour.'

Massinger was in want from the time he went to London until towards the close of his life. In nearly all of his dedications, he expresses thanks to some one who has relieved his wants. Gifford¹⁾ has computed that the highest sum Massinger could have gained in any one year, was about fifty pounds, which, he concludes, was sufficiently for his wants if he exercised strict economy. But Gifford did not know that Massinger had a mother, several sisters, and probably a wife and children dependent upon him. Besides he could only gain this maximum when his plays were successful. Some were not.²⁾ He was then necessarily dependent upon the chance bounty of his friends. Coleridge³⁾ has remarked how goading the humility of having to accept patronage must have been to Massinger's pride. But hunger has little pride. He was sensitively proud, but his necessity allowed it no play. His patrons could not have been very munificent, for in each following year, he appears to have been more humbly thankful for favours received than the year before. During the latter part of his life he produced one, sometimes two, and even three plays a year, and the dedications are all equally expressive of great want. In one dedication, expressing thanks for many favours, he says: 'I had not to this time subsisted, but that I was supported by your frequent courtesies and favours'.⁴⁾ These dedications give us an idea of what must have been his poverty. Massinger has been accused of querulousness and of making constant complaints against the meagreness of his fortunes. When we consider in what condition Massinger had lived in his youth, and the greatness of his wants, the 'free confessions of his poverty'

¹⁾ Introduction p. XXXIII—IV.

²⁾ In the dedication of '*The Guardian*' he says

'After twice putting forth to sea, his fame
Shipwrecked in either and his once known name
In two years silence buried'

³⁾ Introduction p. III.

⁴⁾ Dedication of '*The Maid of Honour*'.

do not appear so much the peevish utterances of a man dissatisfied with his station in life, as the bitter humility of an humbled pride. In his plays he shows a manly firm heroism; but his plays were the fruits of his noble mind, undegraded, uncrushed by the weight of biting physical want. His dedications, or those in which he so openly returns thanks, or sues for assistance, were the promptings of the flesh, depressed by poverty. It would have been out of place in him to have adopted a haughty tone in his dedications, for the world then, as now, considered the pride of a poor man more worthy of pity than respect. It is true, that in those dedications where he returns thanks for favours already received, we find an underlying tone of self-abasement but not of abject servility, and his thanks are openly and frankly confessed. His poverty is to him no matter of shame. He tries not to conceal how great his wants have been, or how much he is indebted to his different patrons for their relief.

We do not know if after long years of want, hardship and suffering, he did not find in Philip, the brother of his departed enemy, William Herbert, a patron, who, it is to be fondly hoped, secured to him in his last days, at least enough to live, surrounded with some degree of comfort. Philip was now rich, and Clarendon¹⁾ says extravagant, at the head of the Pembroke family and liberal. Massinger in the dedication of *'The Bondman'* says 'he could never arrive at the happiness to be made known to his Lordship'. This dedication was published in 1624, that is 22 years after Massinger had left Wilton. Philip left Wilton, and went to Oxford in 1592, being then 9 years of age, Massinger 8. Philip's acquaintance, before he left, could not have been very intimate, even with his mother's page, or with the son of one of his father's gentlemen. After Massinger went to Oxford, and had had the difference with the then head of the Pembroke family, he naturally regarded his connection with that family as entirely severed. Even had this connection with the Herbert family been allowed to grow weak with time, and had not been interrupted by

¹⁾ Clarendon (p. 47) allows Philip another good quality besides his knowledge of 'horses and dogs'; 'to be believed honest and generous which made him many friends and left him then no enemy'.

Massinger's change of religion, he might still have regarded his acquaintance of more than thirty years before with Philip Herbert, when they were both young lads, as too slight to allow him to presume upon it, especially since Philip had been going up, and he down in the world. If Philip's character was such as Clarendon has sketched, a dissipated young nobleman without learning, it could scarcely have raised any hopes in Massinger of assistance from that quarter. It is not to be presumed that Philip Herbert concerned himself for one whom he had either entirely forgotten, or but faintly recollected. The poet, who had not forgotten the young, now almost old Lord, was suffering from extreme poverty; he was encouraged by hearing that his new play '*The Bondman*' which had received a 'Bespeak' to Court, had 'by the liberal suffrage of his Lordship been allowed for current'. This gave him encouragement to attempt to gain that patronage, upon which he felt he had such just claims, the grounds, for which he respectfully urges in the dedication. He had lost his hopes of 'noble protection' by the estrangement from the elder brother, who, when this dedication was written, was still living. But having lost the assistance of William, was no reason for not enjoying that of Philip, could he gain it. To one of Philip Herbert's character, Massinger's religion was a matter of utter indifference. He possessed the minor faults of his brother, and was without many of his redeeming qualities. He could not have been so 'strait-laced' as to found his refusal to assist the poet, upon the ground of his being a catholic, an enemy to his country. He was in after years considered one himself. Much has been written upon Massinger's remark 'However I could never arrive at the happiness to be made known to your Lordship', and much confusion has been created by it. Some seem to think that, by that, he means he had often attempted to see the young Earl and make his acquaintance, but that the latter had persistently refused to notice his advances. Even admitting he had made one such attempt, that of itself would be sufficient ground for saying he 'could never arrive at the happiness etc. . . .'. That he made such an attempt is more than doubtful. The first attempt of which we know was successful, and had he formerly made fruitless attempts, nothing had occurred which would render Philip Herbert more favourably inclined towards the

Poet, nor would the latter have dedicated his play to one who had handled him so meanly before. It would seem that Massinger, being encouraged by consideration of the relations which formerly existed between his family and that of the nobleman whom he for so many years had not seen, felt it to be but proper that he should give some excuse for not having applied to him earlier. His excuse is, 'However I could never arrive at the happiness to be made known to your Lordship', and may be taken to mean, I have never arrived at the happiness to be made known to your Lordship, you being so preoccupied with other affairs, and I being incessantly busy with my plays. Indeed this is the excuse he makes in his '*Sero sed serio*' lines to the same nobleman, for not having presented his 'hymeneal song' with the rest, on the marriage of this lord's son, when he bit his 'star-crossed pen, Too busy in stage blanks, and trifling rhymes'. Not that the two have any connection, but the excuse in both is the same. In making this new application for favour, Massinger would scarcely have begun by recalling to Philip Herbert's mind his former neglect and coldness. The application could not have been a new one; it must have been the first. Again, in making this application, he speaks of a 'desire born with him, to make a tender of all duties and service to the noble family of the Herberts'; a form of address which he would not have used, and which would have been unnecessary, had this not been the first occasion he had had, of recalling to the Earl's mind his manifold claims upon his beneficence. This is perfectly intelligible however, under the explanation that he could never arrive at the happiness to be known to his Lordship, because he had been too much occupied to make himself known to him. The '*could*' has no reference to what Philip Herbert had done, but to what Massinger had been unable to do. The Earl's son was married in 1536, and died soon after. Upon the latter occasion Massinger wrote his rather unpoetical lines entitled '*Sero sed serio*'. In this he speaks of the many favours he had received from his 'Right Honourable and most singular Good Lord and Patron Philip etc. . . .' 'Mine being more, Than they could owe, who' From this we see, that the Poet, in his latter days was assisted by the kindness of this Herbert, brother to him, who had neglected him in his

younger days. William Herbert's conduct was, from his standpoint, just, and hence, from ours, excusable, but it was merciless and to be regretted. His neglect of Massinger may have compelled him to write more than he otherwise would have done, had he and his family been supported by the liberal Lord Pembroke. It is to be hoped that Massinger in his old age, had enough to live in comfort. Luxury he never enjoyed after he went to Oxford.

Massinger died in his house on the Bankside, and was buried in St. Saviour's; the entry of his interment runs so: 1638. *March* 18. Philip Masenger, Stranger, in the Church 2 £¹⁾ According to Wood, he was attended to the grave by the comedians. This may have been an unusual honour. The expenses of Fletcher's burial were 22 shillings, of Massinger's, 2 pounds. 'This sum of 2 £, says Collier, would rather show that Massinger was interred with peculiar cost and ceremony.' Why should Massinger be buried with peculiar cost and ceremony? The answer is plain: he was buried according to the rites of the Catholic Church. He was, according to Sir Aston Cockayne²⁾, buried in St. Mary Overie's Church in Southwark. Sir Aston has an Epitaph on Mr. John Fletcher and Mr. Philip Massinger, who lie buried both in one grave in St. Mary Overie's Church in Southwark.

'In the same Grave Fletcher was buried, here
Lies the Stage-Poet, Philip Massinger.
Playes they did write together; were great friends,
And now one grave includes them in their ends.
So whom on earth nothing did part, beneath
Here (in their Fames) they lie, in spight of death.'

From this we see that the two were buried together. This fact, however, has been denied; at least that they were buried

¹⁾ *Memoirs of Actors*, by J. Payne Collier, London 1846. p. XIII. Gifford gives the entry of his burial so:

March 20. 1639—40, buried Philip Massinger, a stranger. Gifford appears to have taken this from the Church or Parish Register. Collier gives the above entry, as he copied it from '*the monthly Accounts*'. He considers those accounts the more accurate of the two. Gifford's is 1639—40, by change of system, or style, Collier's 1638—39. Collier, in such affairs, is a reliable authority (?).

²⁾ *Poems of Divers sorts* p. 186.

in the same grave. The Rev. Mr. Dyce, as quoted by Col. Cunningham¹⁾, thinks 'the same grave' means nothing more than the same place of interment. Col. Cunningham, who differs from Mr. Dyce, says, 'in speaking of the expression 'the same grave', 'it will be observed that the idea is repeated in the fourth line, in a yet more definite shape, and the whole epitaph, to my thinking, bears unmistakeable marks of being designed by its writer for cutting on a stone which covered their common grave. I also please myself by imagining that the arrangement was made in accordance with an expressed wish of Massinger himself'. Sir Aston certainly understood the meaning of the words he used, if he did make somewhat free with their pronounciation, and when he mentions the 'same grave', he really means the same grave.²⁾ Not only is the idea repeated in the fourth line, in a yet more definite shape, but in the heading of the epitaph, which Col. Cunningham has overlooked, he says as clearly as he can that they were buried 'both in one grave'. Mr. Dyce never saw the heading of the epitaph perhaps, or he would not have disputed that they lie buried both in one grave. 'In Gifford's time, every stone and fragment of a stone was examined in the hope of finding some indication of the particular shot where these great poets were interred', but the search was altogether fruitless.

Massinger's character is only known to us through his dedications, and his works, which like the Elfin-mantel in the fairy tale, shrivel upon the cuckold-shoulders of meaner minds, and only hang in flowing grace around the form of symmetrical Genius. From his dedications, which Hartley Coleridge calls 'beautiful samples of mother English', we see that he was

¹⁾ Introduction XVII.

²⁾ Gifford says (Introduction p. XIV.) 'It would be an abuse of language to honour any composition of Sir Aston with the name of poetry, but the steadiness of his regard for Massinger may be justly praised'. One anecdote will best illustrate the power for verse-composition possessed by 'the celebrated old Derbyshire Poet'. The MS. of '*The Obstinate Lady*' fell into the hands of a Publisher, while Sir Aston was out of town; he printed it as if it were prose! 'And though that comedy be very much of it writ in number'. This however, to do the worthy knight justice, has happened to more classical Authors than himself.

very grateful, one of the principal qualities necessary to a noble character. He was sensitively proud; too much so to let him receive a 'benefit in a corner' that is, without making due acknowledgement of it. He was poor, and his pride was constantly humbled. His earlier dedications show more independence than the later, but as his indigence was never raised to competency, as he found that he was ever to be dependent upon the kindness of his friends, he then appears to have adopted that 'tone of complaint which seems to have become habitual to him'.

That he was often in debt, cannot be doubted; we know that he was ever in want until his latter days. Massinger was also reverent and never profane.¹⁾ In the purity of his heart, he was not unlike his conjectured God-father, Sir Philip Sydney. A vein of chivalrous ardour in defence of right, runs through all his plays. Black deeds are painted in black colours.

It has been remarked; 'In his plays he frequently violates the keeping of character in order to intrude his own manly political sentiments and ideas'.²⁾ His own character was delicately modulated to the breathings of purity. The absence of harsh metaphors from his style, which was remarked even by Charles Lamb, was en rapport with the 'equanimity of passions' of his own character. His pride was never the subject of ridicule, never the object of hatred. He had no right, which the world would acknowledge as such, to be proud. And yet, where he speaks his own sentiments, with his own voice, he never rises higher than to the expression of manly independence and self-confidence. His temper was evenly balanced. His modesty was closely allied to bashfulness. Thos. Jay in some lines on his '*New Way to pay Old Debts*', says,

¹⁾ Massinger has been very justly accused of obscenity. That it was not natural to him, all admit. The taste of his audiences demanded it. To show how he regarded it, read his own opinion, expressed in the dedication of '*The Roman Actor*' 'the most perfect birth of his Minerva'. 'If the gravity and height of the subject distaste such as are only affected with jigs and ribaldry (as I presume it will) their condemnation of me and my poem can no way offend me: my reason teaching me, such malicious and ignorant detractors deserve rather contempt than satisfaction'.

²⁾ *Literature of the Age of Elisabeth*, By Edwin P. Whipple. Boston 1869 p. 178.

'You remember, how you chid me, when I ranked you equal to those glorious men, Beaumont and Fletcher'. Sir Aston admonishes him 'Forbear thy modesty'. That Massinger was ambitious for fame was but natural, and it was the most praiseworthy of all ambition, aspiration to a noble object, with hope of attainment founded on the self-confidence of ability to reach it. 'Though I have been ambitious of fame, As poets are, and would preserve a name', he says in '*Sero sed serio*'. W. B. says in some lines upon '*The Bondman*', 'Nor does he write to please, but to endure'.

Massinger had many friends, and many appear to have been friends of long standing, but though they all address him lovingly respectfully and even affectionately, their devotion never pours itself out in such an outburst of affection as Jonson's 'How I do love thee Beaumont and thy muse'. He was evenly balanced, little erratic in disposition, and his light shone with a steady unwavering glow, never breaking out into the brilliant quivering flashes of Genius, which excite phrenzied enthusiasm or impulsive admiration. Lamb says: 'his works are read with placid delight', and so he was affected by his friends. He appears to have been grave and taciturn. Coleridge thinks he was too much so, to have engaged in the wit-combats at the Mitre or Mermaid; the famous places of carousal, in which Shakespeare and Jonson had their celebrated naval engagements.

Massinger was unobtrusive and retiring, only coming out of his seclusion to render thanks for assistance or to make an attempt to obtain it. 'He went his way unobserved but by the few, unobserving of the many; poverty his constant companion, genius his only solace. 'His sepulchre was like his life, obscure: like the nightingale, he sung darkling — it is to be feared, like the nightingale in the fable, with his breast against a thorn' (Coleridge).

The writer has succeeded in collecting some new facts about our poet's family, which were not known to his previous biographers, and which are not without interest. Arthur Massinger was born in Gloucester in 1550, and at a comparatively early age he entered the service of the Pembroke family, served in it many years, died in London and was buried June the 4th 1603 in St. Dunstan in-the-West. The entry

runs so: '1603 June 4th Mr. Arthur Messenger, Gent. was buried out of Shere Lane'.¹⁾ Ann Massinger, the mother of the Poet, was born most probably in Gloucester. The year of her birth was 1566. As Philip appears to have been the eldest child, Ann was married to Arthur when eighteen or nineteen years of age; he being about thirty-one or thirty-two. After her husband's death, she was dependent upon what he had left her, and most probably upon her son. After his death, she returned to Gloucester, and died there, being buried in the Cathedral Church, Oct. 21st 1636 in the seventieth year of her age.²⁾ Philip Massinger had several sisters, the eldest of whom we know being Elisabeth. She was born in 1592, most probably at Wilton, unless at London during one of the winter visits of the family to the City. She was a spinster, and died unmarried. She no doubt was also dependent upon her brother during his life, returning with her mother to Gloucester after his death. She lived to be very old, dying in the seventy-third year of her age. She was buried in the Cathedral Church of Gloucester in 1665.³⁾

In the same church in which Arthur Massinger was buried, were baptized three of his daughters. They were baptized as the daughters of 'Arthur Messenger Esquier'. The first was Susan, baptized Jan. 13. 1594, the second Catharine, Dec. 23. 1596, the third Barbara Jan. 3rd 1599.⁴⁾ Nothing further

¹⁾ *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* etc. vol. XIV. Boston 1860. p. 75 (Article by Geo. W. Messinger).

²⁾ *A new History of Gloucestershire*. By Samuel Rudder, Cirencester, 1779 p. 173. Inscriptions in the Cathedral Church. Here lyeth the body of Ann Massinger, who was wife and widow of Arthur Massinger of this city, aged 52 years. She departed this life Oct. 21. 1636. Aetatis suae 70.

³⁾ p. 124. Here lyeth the body of Elisabeth, daughter of Arthur Messenger of this City, Gent., who departed this life A. D. 1665. Aetatis suae 73.

⁴⁾ It might appear peculiar that Arthur Massinger's children were baptized at London did we not recollect that they were undoubtedly born during some of the winter visits of the Herberts to London. The above dates are taken from the article by Mr. Geo. W. Messinger in the N. E. Gen. Register, above quoted. Mr. Messinger inspected these records of St. Dunstan himself. It was through a Cross-reference of Mr. Messinger that the writer found the entries given in Rudder's '*New History of Gloucester*'.

is known of these sisters of the poet. Perhaps they remained in London, if they all survived, as they did not return to Gloucester with their mother.

It cannot now be definitely settled if the Poet was married or not. We have no reason to believe he was not, except his poverty, but we have little reason to think he was. Peter Cunningham¹⁾ says 'Philip Massinger's widow lived at Cardiff in Glamorganshire; when did she die?' How Mr. Cunningham knows this fact, is difficult to say. His school of literary investigation is painfully accurate in some respects; especially as regards giving the originals, verbatim et literatim. It is strange, that on a point so weighty as this, he should say that such is the case, and give no authority for the statement. Col. Cunningham appears, from a remark in his Introduction to Massinger's work, to be the son of Mr. Peter Cunningham, yet in this Introduction he overlooks this statement entirely. Mr. Cunningham speaks of this as if it were a well known fact, whereas no biographers, including even Col. Cunningham, who was the last, have ever had reason to imagine that Massinger was married. There is, however, one fact which tends to substantiate this assertion of Peter Cunningham. In the London Magazine for Aug. 4th 1762, is recorded the death of 'Miss Henrietta, a descendant of Massinger, the dramatic Poet'. Mr. Cunningham may have had authority for his statement, and it is much to be regretted that he did not give it. That, together with the above notice, may lead us to suspect that our poet was married. The authority of the London Magazine is however, doubtful, unless we can find some more reliable evidence to strengthen it.

One who writes the life of any one of the older English Authors, of whom so little is recorded can hope to add at most but a few points to what little we already know. But in this case, as in that of the philosopher, we find that the more one learns, the more one has to learn. Where we have no facts, we are compelled to deal with probabilities. But in dealing with probabilities, we are apt to trust more to the Fancy and Imagination, than to the Understanding and Judgement. In this case, it too frequently happens that we imagine

¹⁾ *Notes and Queries* 3rd Series. Vol. I. p. 188.

we are following the latter, when we are wandering with the former. What we consider a clear logical conclusive chain of argument is as often a phantasia. In writing the above life of Massinger, the writer hopes to have added some facts to the life of the poet, which were not known to his previous biographers.¹⁾ Having some new material at his command, and having studied conscientiously that which was already known, he hopes to have cleared up at least enough to have increased the sum positive of our knowledge of Massinger's life. In combining what material he has had, light has been thrown upon some dark spots; light which every one can see, and must acknowledge as such. But this was only in some cases. In others, the light may not be so palpable. He has thought it better to leave in doubt what is not known, rather than, by trying to make the whole edifice complete, to weaken the solid parts by adding unhealthy material.

In trying to avoid the errors mentioned, he has stated all surmises to be such, and however pleasing any fancies may be, he has considered them more as the lucky penny of the Irish peasant, than as forming a part of the bargain itself. Where he has dealt with possibilities and probabilities, he has attempted to arrive at the right position, and to make that position as conclusive as possible: so conclusive as to produce conviction in an unbiassed mind. But he does not wish to conceal that he considers it possible they may not always produce conviction, and where such is the case, he is unwilling that the doubt which may exist in any mind as regards certain points, should weaken confidence in the whole. Some points can only attain to the dignity of facts, by pro-

¹⁾ Gifford is the only writer who has conscientiously written the life of Massinger. His successors have copied him except where they have differed from him, when they have put that fact upon record, and there let the matter rest. The only real additions since have been made by J. Payne Collier. Collier has made important additions to our knowledge of the writers of that day, but he is unreliable. Whether — to use a trite phrase — this be his fault or misfortune, one feels hesitancy in saying, but certain it is that no one feels inclined to accept his authority unreservedly. The writer of this has had but little hesitation in using his 'Massinger and Daborne letter' but the entry of Massinger's burial looks suspicious.

ducing universal conviction. Until such become the case, he wishes this dissertation to be judged by that which even the most prejudiced will admit it has added to the knowledge of Massinger's life and works.

II. The Plays of Philip Massinger.

The works of many of our great dramatists are confused. Shakespeare's works have given rise to long and heated discussion, patient and diligent investigation. The results which have been reached are, in many respects, gratifying proofs of mental ingenuity. The plays of Massinger are or have been in greater disorder, but no one appears to have been aware of the fact. Massinger has been neglected, nor have any of his numerous editors ever thought it worthy of their ability to attempt to bring some degree of order into this chaotic confusion. The writers of the *Biographica Dramatica*¹⁾ are the only ones who have attempted anything in this branch of the work. Gifford follows Malone, and Malone paid no attention to Massinger. He simply arranged his plays as most convenient, and was inaccurate. It appears impossible that Malone could have inspected the Register of the Stationer's Company. Those who followed Gifford, accepted his authority as they copied his text. Unfortunately the pains Gifford gave himself in arranging Massinger's plays, were not commensurate with the labour he bestowed upon his text. The latter is unequalled. The former are confused in the greatest degree. In such an ample field for investigation, the writer of this can scarcely hope to exhaust the subject, and is fully conscious of his short-comings, but he does hope to be able to make a beginning worthy of the subject of which, and of the object for which this is written. If he succeed in preserving one play of Massinger as his, which is now considered lost, he will be amply repaid by, if not satisfied with, the result of his labours. Though well aware that much is still to be

¹⁾ *Biographica Dramatica*. 2 vols. London 1812.

done, he still hopes to be of some assistance to the one who, fitted for completing the work, may yet undertake it.

The exact dates of Massinger's earlier works are not known. We know the year before which, but not in which they were composed. Many of them have been lost by the negligence of Mr. John Warburton, Somerset Herald. This Mr. Warburton was an eager collector of manuscript literature, and succeeded in making a very large collection. Unfortunately, however, his diligence in preserving them was not equal to his success in collecting them. In a note written at the end of the list of the works he had collected, he describes how he lost them.

'After I had been many years collecting these MSS. Playes, through my own carelessness, and the ignorance of my ser(vant) in whose hands I had lodged them, they was unluckely burned or put under pye bottoms, excepting the three which followes. JW.'¹⁾

This list contains many mistakes. In numerous cases, Warburton has given a play, which had two titles, as two different plays. It is much to be regretted that these MSS. fell into the hands of a person so illiterate and negligent.

Before proceeding to the plays themselves, it may be remarked that there is no authority but precedent for the order in which the earlier plays are given. Gifford made this arrangement, and though there is no convincing reason for so arranging them, there is yet no reason why they should now be changed.²⁾

1. Minerva's Sacrifice or The Forced Lady. Tragedy.

Gifford gives this as two different plays. It is so given in Warburton's list, and in this order:

¹⁾ Lansdowne Collection of MSS. in the British Museum. 80—7.

²⁾ Wood in his list of Massinger's works, gives '*The Powerful Favourite or the Life of Sejanus, a History*, printed 1628. 4^o'. This work had the initials P. M. attached to it. The *Dictionnaire Historique* (Amsterdam, 1753, Chauffepié Tome III.), explains this: it says 'mais c'est une méprise, cette Pièce n'étant qu'une Traduction de la vie de Sejan par Pierre de Moulin'. In the *Biographical History of England* (2nd Edition, London 1775, vol. I. p. 300) we find that Peter du Moulin 'fled from the persecutions of the protestants in France, to pursue his studies in England'.

'Minerva's Sacrifice Phill. Massinger.

The forced Lady a. T. by Phill. Massinger.'

Malone mentions '*Minerva's Sacrifice*', as having been acted in 1629. Gifford thence concluded that these two titles were each the title of a different play, and finding no other mention of '*The Forced Lady*', numbers it '1.', and '*Minerva's Sacrifice* '23'.¹⁾ In the Register of the Stationer's Company²⁾ is entered in Sept. 1653 '*Minerva's Sacrifice or The Forced Lady*'. From this we see that '*The Forced Lady*' had been revived under the title of '*Minerva's Sacrifice*' but that the two titles denote the same play.

2. The Noble Choice or The Orator. Comedy.

Gifford gives this play also as two. Warburton's list contains only '*The Noble Choice* A. C. P. Massinger'. According to Malone '*The Orator*' was acted in 1634—35. Gifford supposed this to be two plays, and numbers '*The Noble Choice* '2' '*The Orator* '33'. On the Register it is entered as above.

3. The Wandering Lovers or The Painter. C.

Gifford only gives the title of '*The Wandering Lovers*'. The Register informs us that the title was as above given.

In the life of Massinger it has been mentioned that he wrote plays with Fletcher. This appears to have been one of them. In Sir Henry Herbert's *Office Book*³⁾ Dec. 6th 1623 is entered '*The Wandering Lovers*'. By the Deputy Master of the Revels, under date of Dec. 6th 1624 is entered '*The Wandering Lovers* written by Mr. Fletcher'.⁴⁾ Both entries denote

¹⁾ 'Four only of the plays named in Warburton's list occur in the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert, which is continued up to the latest period of Massinger's life: it is, therefore, evident that they must have been written previous to its commencement. ' Introduction p. XX. In his first edition, Gifford gave '*The Secretary*' in the list of Massinger's plays. It has since been discovered to be by a John Massinger, and indeed was not a play, but a translation of some French Letters. It occurred in '*The English Parnassus, or a Helpe to English Poetry* etc. by Joshua Poole M. A. London 1657. p. 41. The books principally made use of in compiling this work'.

²⁾ I am much indebted to the Clerk of the Stationer's Company, Mr. Rivington, for kind permission to examine the Registers of the Company, and take this opportunity of expressing my thanks.

³⁾ Collier's *Annals* vol. I. p. 437.

⁴⁾ p. 446 of the same.

the same play, and we know at least the name of one play, which they wrote together. Massinger's name was connected with it after Fletcher's death. There is another play with very nearly the same title, '*The Wandering Lover*', which was printed in 1658. This was written by one T. M. Gent.¹⁾ An acrostic on the fly leaf informs us that this T. M. Gent. was a certain Thomas Meriton. It appears more than probable that the plot of Fletcher and Massinger's play was used in this, as the similarity of title could scarcely have been a mere coincidence. Another fact, worthy of remark is, that the T. M. looks remarkably like P. M. I suspect that the acrostic was added after the work had been published. If so, it would seem that the author was willing to take advantage of the mistake which would arise in the minds of those who knew of Massinger, but had never heard of Meriton. It may be safely stated that however the plot may have been borrowed, little of Fletcher's or Massinger's genius is to be traced in this play. It gives evidence of a very inferior order of talent.

4. Philenzo and Hippolita. TC.

The *Biographica Dramatica*²⁾ remarks 'This surely could not be, as Mr. Oulton has suggested, Massinger's *Philenzo and Hippolita*, for Massinger, being born 1584, could be but ten years old when the present piece was performed. This was entered on the Stationer's Register as being by Massinger. He, following a custom of that age, had doubtless made alterations in this play.

5. Antonio and Vallia. C.

This was acted in 1595³⁾, and was entered on the Register by H. Moseley as by Massinger. He had therefore merely made alterations in it.

6. The Tyrant. T.

This play is generally called '*The Second Maid's Tragedy*'. '*The Tyrant*' has been considered lost by all editors of Massinger.

¹⁾ '*The Wandering Lover, a Tragi-Comedy*, being acted several times privately etc. Written by T. M. Gent. London 1658. printed.'

²⁾ Baker, Reed and Jones. London 1812.

³⁾ According to Hinchlow's list of plays, given in Malone's '*Historical Account*' prefixed to his Shakespeare.

This, however, is not the case. It was entered on the books of the Stationer's Company June 29, 1660. There is now in the British Museum a folio of three MSS. the only ones saved from Warburton's fire. To this MS. is prefixed Warburton's list. On the last page of one of the plays, and below the *finis*, has been written 'This *Second Maydens Tragedy* (for it hath no name inscribed) may with the reformatiōns bee acted publickly, 31. Octobre. G. Buc'. On the back of this leaf has been written. '*The Second Maydens Tragedy*, October 31th 1611'. Just below this have been written several names of authors, to whom this play was attributed. The B. D. under the head of '*The Second Maiden's Tragedy*' gives a clear account of this MS. as it now exists in the British Museum. 'This play is in MS. in the library of the Marquis of Lansdown, and is one of those which escaped the general havoc made by Mr. Warburton's servant. It was entered on the books of the Stationer's Company Sept. 9. 1653, but had been licensed so long before as Oct. 31. 1611. The name of the author in the title-page seems from the traces of the letter, originally to have been Thomas Goffe, but this is carefully obliterated and Geo. Chapman substituted in its stead, which has again been blotted out to make room for William Shakespeare. The latter name, however, is written in a modern character, and with ink of a different colour from the rest. We do not, however, believe this piece to have been the composition either of Goffe or Chapman. It is in many parts distinguished by an elegance and tenderness superior to theirs, and is no where disgraced by such ridiculous extravagances as characterize their known productions.'

We see from this that the names given are not reliable. Warburton gives in the first part of his list, '*The Tyrant a Tragedy by Phill. Massenger*'. Towards the end, he has '2nd pt. *Maydens Trag.* Geo. Chapman'. This list is teeming with errors, and proves very clearly that he had written it very inordinately and hastily. A part of the list appears to have been written at a later date than the rest. Most probably after the loss of his MSS. Warburton, in forming his list, copied '*The Tyrant*' from the title-page. This title-page was lost with the other MSS. He, forgetting that he had already entered this play on his list under another name, and

thinking the title which Sir George Buck had given the play to be the right one, again copied it on his list as *Maiden's Tragedy*. Sir Geo. Buck had given this play that name, on account of its resemblance to Fletcher's *Maid's Tragedy*, and because the author had neglected to inscribe the title. We hence see that this was not the title which the author gave his play. But what was the name given it? We have only to read it through, and it is clear that the name of the play was, and must have been, *The Tyrant*. The tyrant is known by no other name. He enters as tyrant, he speaks as tyrant, he is spoken of as the tyrant, and the tyrant is the central figure of the plot. The name must necessarily have been '*The Tyrant*'; otherwise the entire play is inexplicable. *Tyrant* was no proper name, and unless the name of the play be '*The Tyrant*', we should be at a loss to know why he is so persistently called 'the Tyrant'. Tieck¹⁾ describes how he read this play, and came to the conclusion that it was '*The Tyrant*' of Massinger, from internal evidence.²⁾ To him belongs the credit of having first identified it with Massinger's supposed lost play. The B. D. says 'A MS. Tragedy, called *The Tyrant* was sold Nov. 1759, among the books of John Warburton Esquire'. As only three of Warburtons MSS. were saved, this must have been '*The Tyrant*' entered on his list, and which was by Massinger. It came into the hands of the Marquis of Lansdown, and thence to the British Museum. While in possession of the Marquis of Lansdown, Gifford, who was then editing Massinger's works, for some reason was too proud to apply for permission to examine it. Had he done so, he would doubtless have printed it in his edition, for there can be no doubt that it is by Massinger. As Gifford neglected this play, the subsequent editors of the Poet did the same. It is high time that it should be printed in the authors works, for it has the double interest of being an important addition to his works, and of being the earliest extant play of his which we have.

¹⁾ *Shakespeare's vorschule* 2 vols. Leipzig 1823. Vol. 2, vorrede p. XL. Tieck has translated this play as being by Massinger.

²⁾ Mr. Ward, in his *Hist. of Engl. Dram. Liter.* (Vol. II. p. 272, note) says of the horrors in the last act of *the Duke of Milan*, 'they resemble those of *the Second Maidens Tragedy*'.

7. Fast and Welcome. C.

Occurs in Warburton's list. Entered by Moseley in 1660. Nothing more is known of it.

8. A Very Woman or The Woman's Plot T. C.

This is given by Gifford as two plays. Only '*The Woman's Plot*' occurs in Warbuton's list. '*The Woman's Plot*' was acted at Court in 1621. '*A Very Woman*' was acted in 1634. '*The Very Woman*' was printed 8° 1655. Hence Gifford supposed it to be two plays. The B. D.¹⁾ explains the matter so, 'we find, from an entry on the Stationer's book, by H. Moseley Sept. 9. 1653, that this was originally the second title to Massinger's *Very Woman*, which is printed among his works'. The Poet wrote '*The Woman's Plot*' when quite young and it was then acted. He afterwards made some alterations in it, and it was published in 1655 as '*A Very Woman or a Prince of Tarent*' together with two other plays in 8°. The MS. of '*The Woman's Plot*' fell into the hands of Warburton. In the Prologue of '*A Very Woman*' the author

'To such. and some there are, no question, here
Who, happy in their memories, do bear
This subject, long since acted, and can say
Verily, we have seen something like this play',

answers, that he undertook the task of 'reviewing this play' at the request of his patron, and considers he has much bettered it. This alludes to '*The Woman's Plot*'. Gifford has a remark on this play in his introductory remarks before '*A Very Woman*'. He says: we learn from the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert, that a play of Massinger's called '*The Spanish Viceroy*', was acted in 1624: this was not improbably the piece alluded to in the prologue. But this is not all. In the MS. Register of Lord Stanhope of Harrington the play *Cardenes* or *Cardenio* is said to have been performed at Court, in 1613. Mr. Malone conjectures that this might have been the first sketch of what Massinger improved and brought out in 1624, and finally completed as we now have it'. This play has

¹⁾ Under '*A Very Woman*' in the volumes of Plays, '*The Woman's Plot*' is not mentioned. In the list of Plays under Massinger, they do not give '*The Woman's Plot*'. The remark, quoted above, is given under '*The Woman's Plot*'.

nothing to do with '*The Spanish Viceroy*' for that was entered at the same time in the Register with '*A Very Woman*' by the same person, and as two entirely different plays. *Cardenes* is indeed a character in '*A Very Woman*'. It is not impossible that this play of '*Cardenes*' may have been a youthful sketch of what was afterwards '*The Woman's Plot*' (not '*Spanish Viceroy*'), and then '*A Very Woman*'. But a similarity of name signifies nothing. Even in the plays which we still have, there are the same names in different plays.

9. The Old Law or A new Way to please you. C.

This play was acted long before Massinger could have been old enough to write a play. In the 4^o, which was published 1656, the authors names are given: Phil. Massinger, Tho. Middleton and William Rowley.¹⁾ It has been conjectured that Massinger was engaged to make alterations in it. This conjecture bears its proof on its face. Gifford says Massinger's share in it was inconsiderable.

10. The Virgin Martyr.

In this play, Massinger was assisted by Decker, 'a highflyer of wit, even against Ben Jonson himself'. This is one of the poet's earliest works.²⁾ We find alterations were made in it in 1620. It was printed 4^o in 1622, 1631, 1651, 1661. Also in J. S. Keltie's *Works of the British Dramatists*, 1870, Edinburgh. Again, with six designs by F. R. Pickersgill. It has been generally admitted that Decker composed those parts of this play which disgust us by their filthiness. To Decker is assigned by Chas. Lamb in his *Extracts*, the scene between Dorothea and Angelo in the second act. Better authority for

¹⁾ A Catalogue of 'all the plays with the plays with the authors names' was added to this 4^o. Langbaine's astonishment was excited by 'Virgil's Eclogues being inserted under the name of a Tragedy'.

²⁾ This is not only one of the poet's earliest works, but long continued one of his most popular; perhaps on account of the music. Pepys (Diary, 3rd ed. London 1848. 5 vols. vol. I p. 192) saw it acted 1660—61, and (vol. IV. p. 373) 1667. The first time he saw it, Pepys found it 'a good but too sober a play for the company'. In 1667 he finds it 'mighty pleasant: not that the play is worth much, but it is finely acted by Beck Marshall. What he especially liked was the 'wind musick, when the angel comes down, which is so sweet that it ravished me, and indeed, in a word, did wrap up my soul that it made me really sick, just as I have formerly been when in love with my wife'.

the same statement though is Gifford in his note to this scene. This play has been ranked high among the plays of Massinger. It is much to be regretted that it has been soiled by impurities such as Hircius and Spungius. A writer of the earlier part of the 18th Century considered it worth stealing and stole it. He produced a play, which he titled '*Injured Virtue or the Virgin Martyr*'.¹⁾ In a dedication of several pages, and in the prologue no credit is given to the real authors.²⁾ In fact he speaks of it as being only by himself. In some respects, the alteration is a decided improvement upon the original. The whole is well written, or selected. The foul obscenity has been omitted, and much of the supernatural. Harpax is not introduced, which is a mistake on the part of the alterer. Sapritius is a combination of his former self and Harpax, and appears in the last act to Theophilus. Calista and Cristeta are not put to death, as the captain of the Guard secretes them. The greatest fault of the alterer is in having omitted Angelo, and substituted an attendant, Hellenia. This decreases the supernatural, but it destroys the force of the play as such. We are not more liable to be deceived by a small than a large amount of the unnatural. Dorothea appears to Theophilus at the last, and brings him a cross; an idea, not less miraculous than the apples, and far less poetical. The best thoughts and sentiments of the original have been retained, and the change of phraseology has generally been most happily accomplished. The greatest blemish of this latter day performance is, that their due has not been rendered the real authors.

11. The Unnatural Combat. T.

This is one of our Author's earliest pieces as we learn from the dedication. It was printed in 1639, 4^o. Also in Dodsley's *Select Collection of Old Plays*.³⁾ Neel says 'indeed the genius of Massinger is perhaps more conspicuous in this

¹⁾ *Injured Virtue or the Virgin Martyr*, a Tragedy, as it was acted at the Play House in Richmond. By Benjamin Griffin. London 1715.

²⁾ but I hope your generous temper will with your usual candour pass by its defects, and accept it for the intent of the giver, rather than the merits of the piece.

³⁾ vol. 8., 1744. 12^o.

play, with all its faults, than in any other'.¹⁾ This is doubted by Gifford, who thinks it unsuited to the stage, but grants that it shows evidence of deep genius. The passion on which the plot turns is so foreign to the moral sentiments of the present time, that it can never awaken in us any other feelings than those of disgust. The success depends upon its meeting sympathy in the audience or readers.

12. *The Duke of Milan*. T.

This appears to have been very popular, and was printed twice, 4^o in 1623, again in 1638. It has since then held a place in nearly all collections of plays. This play has suffered many alterations, and some attempts have been made to revive it, with these improvements. All, however, were fruitless. It was altered in 1816, and acted several times at Bath and London.²⁾ According to the B. D. '*The Duke of Milan*, Tragedy by Richard Cumberland', was acted in 1729. It was an incorporation of Massinger's play and Fenton's *Mariamne*. The piece failed. Gifford says, in speaking of the resemblance between this play and Fenton's *Mariamne*, 'That Fenton had read Massinger before he wrote his tragedy is certain from internal evidence: there are not, however, many marks of similarity . . .' Campbell has made some extracts from this play, and prefixed some very appropriate criticisms.

13. *The Bondman*. T. C.

This was printed 4^o in 1624, 1638. Coleridge's³⁾ criticism, that this is a 'delightful play', has been universally agreed to, by all critics. The consummation is reached in easy natural stages, no character 'being wound up to any high pitch, blindly and wilfully following the dictates of some passion, which is forced and constrained'; a reproach which Hazlitt has justly made against Massinger. It long kept its place on the stage. Pepys saw it acted in 1661, and found it 'an excellent play and well done'. This has been altered also. Mr. Rich. Cumberland produced his alteration at Covent Garden in 1769.

¹⁾ *Literary Remains*. London 1829. *Lectures on English Poetry*. Lect. IV. p. 129—31.

²⁾ *The Duke of Milan*, a Tragedy in 5 acts. Revived at the Theatre Royal, Drury, with alterations and additions, March 1816. London 1816.

³⁾ *Table-talk* 136—137.

It was, however, coldly received, says B. D. and was never printed. It was revived also at Drury Lane in 1719 by Betterton, under the title of *'The Bondman or Love and Liberty'*, and was printed the same year at London.¹⁾ A scene from this play was printed and handed around as a placard before the expected invasion of Napoleon.²⁾

14. *The Renegado*. T. C.

This was printed in 1630. 4^o. Acted 1624. Malone says: *'The Renegado or the Gentleman of Venice'*, was acted the same year. This second title we owe to the Master of the Revels. Geneste, in his *History of the English Stage*, mentions a play called *The Renegado*. This is one of the most entertaining of Massinger's plays. His humour in this is more effective than in most of his others, though oft wanting in fineness. The critics, as a rule, merely touch upon this play. It seems however to have less errors of plot than most of the others, and the characters have marked individuality.

15. *The Parliament of Love*. C.

This was entered on the Register, as being by Rowley, but the Master of the Revels attributes it to Massinger. Warburton's list attributes it to Rowley also. Mr. Ward suggests, with every degree of probability, that it was a joint work of them both.³⁾ Malone, in his *'Historical Account'*, says, *'The Parliament of Love'*, Nov. 3. 1624. Acted at the Cockpit. Of this play, the last four acts are yet extant in manuscript'. Gifford was engaged on his edition of Massinger when he read the above remark. Wishing to make his edition as complete as possible, he applied for this Ms. Malone sent it to him, in a deplorable condition, and expressed little hope that anything could be done with it. Gifford, however, saved all

¹⁾ It appears to have been printed again, with a slight change of title: *'Love and Liberty'*, a Tragi-Comedy as it is now acted at the Theatre Royal, Drury, by his Majesty's servants, printed for A. Bettesworth. By Philip Massanger.' No doubt a surreptitious edition, printed to undersell Betterton's.

²⁾ Preserved with many others of like nature, in the British Museum, in a large folio, titled *Broadsides etc. relating to the expected invasion of England by Bonaparte*. Act I. Sc. III. Archidamus. You've made us see Sir, to our shame etc. Heading of Broadside, 'Country-men'.

³⁾ vol. II. p. 273.

that human ingenuity could save, a work which few but a Gifford could have accomplished. Gifford thinks not at all meanly of this fragment. But it appears to lack much, compared with even *'The Renegado'*, and utterly unworthy of the author of *'The Fatal Dowry'* though not entirely without poetic beauties.

16. *The Spanish Viceroy or The Honour of Women.* C.

Here again Gifford has made two plays of one play with two titles.¹⁾ Warburton in his list has *'The Honour of Women'*, A. C. by P. Massinger'. *'The Honour of Women'* was acted in 1638. According to Malone, *'The Spanish Viceroy'* was acted in 1624. Neither of these plays was printed, and both are or is lost. The Register again comes to our assistance, and we find that these two titles denote one and the same play. The title had been changed when revived in 1628. As was natural, both titles were given when it was entered on the Register. Malone says *'The Honour of Women'* was licensed May 6. 1628. I suspect that this was the original name of *'The Maid of Honour'*, which was printed in 1631—32, though not entered for the stage in Sir Henry Herbert's book.' *'The Maid of Honour'* appears to have been acted frequently after its first appearance.²⁾ When it was printed, the author dedicated it to two of his worthy friends. In this dedication the author expresses a wish that these two gentlemen 'may peradventure find something in it that may appear worthy of their protection'. It is incredible that this play had already been long known to the public under another name, else had Massinger made some mention of the fact. Gifford considers Malone's guess as 'extremely doubtful', as, indeed, it is. Col. Cunningham³⁾ says it 'is supposed to have been full of allusions to Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador, and stood no chance of being licensed by the Master of the Revels'. The

¹⁾ Gifford says *'The Spanish Viceroy'* was destroyed by Warburton. As he thought this and *'The Honour of Women'* to be two plays, he was wrong, for *'The Spanish Viceroy'* does not occur in Warburton's list.

²⁾ Langbaine says: 'often presented with good allowance, at the Phoenix in Drury-Lane, by the Queen's Majesties Servants',

³⁾ Col. Cunningham makes the same mistake that Gifford made as regards *'The Spanish Viceroy'* having been in the list of Warburton's lost MSS.

players acted it without his license, but were reprimanded, and apologized. Col. Cunningham finds this fact recorded in one of Mr. Collier's numerous publications, and since Mr. Collier 'makes no allusion to Massinger being the author of the play, and as the date of the apology, Dec. 20th treads so closely on the date of the performance of *'The Parliament of Love'*, he is led to suspect that Gifford may have admitted *'The Spanish Viceroy'* into his list on insufficient grounds'. 'If, indeed, he says in conclusion, Massinger were the author of a play in ridicule of Gondomar and his country-men, would it not settle the question of his having become a Papist?' Not at all. Massinger was an Englishman, whatever his creed, and if he heaped ridicule upon a nation politically unpopular in England, he need not have ridiculed the Catholic Faith. So much, admitting that it was filled with allusions to the Spanish Ambassador, which is in no wise certain. Other explanations could be found which would explain why the play stood no chance of being licensed. Nor does it seem possible that Massinger could have afforded to write a play, which stood no chance of being licensed. The title of the play is as above given, *'The Spanish Viceroy or The Honour of Women'*.

17. The Roman Actor. T.

Printed 4^o 1629. This play has been frequently altered. *'The Roman Actor'*, written originally by P. Massenger, and since revived with alterations. London 1722. In 1796, according to the B. D., it was compressed into two acts, and so performed. In 1822 it was acted at Drury Lane with alterations. The only revival which was successful appears to have been that of Betterton in 1722, who took the rôle of Paris 'in which part, says Gifford he was highly celebrated'. This play Massinger considered 'the most perfect birth of his Minerva'. There is, however, more rhetoric than passion in this tragedy. But rhetoric was Massinger's forte. This play is free from 'the jigs and ribaldry' with which he too often truckled to the demands of his audience.

18. The Judge or Believe as you list. T.

Malone says *'The Judge'* was licensed 1627. Sir Henry Herbert refused to license *'Believe as you list'*, in 1630—1.

¹) Introduction p. XII.

We learn from the Register of the Stationer's Company that these two titles denote the same play. '*The Judge or Believe as you list*' was entered by Moseley 1663. Therefore '*The Judge*' could not have been licensed in 1627. Mr. Peter Cunningham, in his Extracts from the Accounts of the Master of the Revels has accused Malone of inaccuracy, and has given several examples of his mistakes. This is another example. The year in which '*The Judge*' was licensed, was most probably 1637. Massinger had changed the title of the piece, and made some alterations no doubt, and got what Sir Henry had refused to license as '*Believe as you list*', licensed as '*The Judge*'. Col. Cunningham says of '*The Judge*', 'I find only the fact that it was acted by the Kings Company on June 6. 1627. It has perished, and left no trace behind', as was quite natural, under these circumstances. '*Believe as you list*' was discovered by one Mr. Beltz in 1844. It was published in 1848 by Mr. Crofton Croker, upon which ensued a squabble between himself and apparently Mr. Collier, in which the latter was worsted. Col. Cunningham printed it for the first time among Massinger's works, and corrected a great many of the more glaring errors. He also has some very interesting remarks on the play, under the head of '*Believe as you list*' in his introduction.

19. The Great Duke of Florence. C.

This comical history was licensed 1627. Printed 4^o 1634. Since then it seems never to have been published except in the collected editions of Massinger's works. Campbell gives extracts from it. The critics speak of it in the highest terms. The plot is old and historical; but the author has turned it to better advantage than any writer before or since.

20. The Maid of Honour. T. C.

Date of first appearance uncertain. Published 1632, 4^o. Kemble revived this play with alterations, in 1785. He met with ill success. Critics vary much as to the relative merits of this play. Some place it in the first rank, some in the second.

21. The Picture. T. C.

Licensed 1629. Published 4^o in 1630. An attempt was made by the Rev. Henry Bate to revive this, though with considerable alterations. B. D. makes the following remarks on

this alteration. '*Magic Picture*, Play, acted at Covent Garden. 8^d. 1783. This was an alteration of Massinger's *Picture* by the Rev. Henry Bate. The alterer has given a new turn to the drama, by making the changes of the picture the effects of Eugenius' jealousy, instead of the magic art of Baptista, by which however, though the improbability of the fable is lessened, the interest is also in some measure diminished.' In his advertisement Mr. Bate says, as regards the measure the same metre through necessity still prevails, except where the language could be reduced to the heroic verse, without impairing the spirit of the dialogue'. As regards the plot of the play, Mr. Reid's criticism in B. D. appears to be the most favourable and just. '..... and thus the passion of jealousy acquires a peculiar kind of turbulence and agitation, which from mere conjectural proofs, could not have belonged to it. Of this difficult and delicate task, Massinger has acquitted himself wonderfully, so that if we can bring ourselves to pardon the deception, it will increase our admiration of the author'. But as Gifford remarks, we tolerate now-a-days no magic but Shakespeare's.

22. The Emperor of the East. T. C.

This, according to Malone, was licensed 1630—31. It was printed 4^o 1632. No attempts seem to have been made to revive this. The B. D. remarks, that 'Lee seems, in his *Theodosius or The Force of Love*, to have borrowed some points from the play before us'. D'Israeli says 'The pantomime characters and the extempore comedy of Italy may have had some influence even on our own dramatic poets: this source has indeed escaped all notice, yet I incline to think it explains a difficult point in Massinger, which has baffled even the keen spirit of Mr. Gifford'.¹⁾ Referring to the character of the Quack in this play, H. Coleridge is of the opinion that the scene of the Empiric in the fourth act has been added by some other hand than that of the author. This play is not without interest, but most of the characters in this, as in so many of Massinger's plays, have but one idea which they

¹⁾ *Curiosities of Literature*, as a new Ed. one vol. London 1866. p. 227. Article on Massinger Milton and the Italian Theatre; he also observes that 'Massinger was a student of Italian Authors'.

follow blindly. Some of the scenes are too disgusting to please.

23. *The Italian Night Piece or The Unfortunate Piety*. T.

Acted 1631. Entered on the Register in 1653. B. D. says, it was among those destroyed by Warburton's servant. This is not true, as it does not occur in his list. Gifford¹⁾, speaking of '*The Fatal Dowry*' makes this remark, 'I once supposed this to be the play which is mentioned above by the name of '*The Unfortunate Piety*', as it does not appear under its present title in the office book of Sir Henry Herbert, but I now believe it to have been written previous to 1623'. In the first and second edition, Gifford gives '*The Unfortunate Piety*' alone. In the third, which is not Gifford's, the name is given as above.

24. *The Fatal Dowry*. T.

Malone says this play does not appear to have been licensed for the stage under that name. It was printed 1632, 4^o. Langbaine says: 'this play was writ by Mr. Nath. Field'. To Field, Gifford assigns all he thinks unworthy of Massinger. This being deemed the best of all our author's tragedies, it has been often revived, and altered: it has, besides, suggested hints to other authors, who scrupled not to use them. An alteration was given at the Haymarket 1758, under the title of '*Insolvent*'. Again in Drury Lane and in Bath in 1825.²⁾ The B. D. notices that 'Nerestan's behaviour also, in the tragedy of *Zara*, seems to owe its origin to this point, though different in some respects as to the particular situation of the action'. But of all alterations of, and thefts from this play, the most noted is Rowe's '*The Fair Penitent*'. Gifford makes this contemptuous fling at Rowe; 'From this play Rowe borrowed, or, according to Cicero's distinction stole, the plan of '*The Fair Penitent*' a performance by which he is now chiefly known. It appears from the introduction of Betterton's edition of *The Bondman* that Rowe had intended bringing out an edition of Massinger complete; however, he was seduced from

¹⁾ Introduction p. XXXVI.

²⁾ '*The Fatal Dowry*, a tragedy altered and adapted for representation. London 1825.'

his purpose by the merits of '*The Fatal Dowry*'. '*The Fair Penitent*' was one of the most popular plays of its day, and was praised by Dr Johnson in almost unqualified terms. All the critics, since the original has been brought to light, unite in damning '*The Fair Penitent*', and in glorifying '*The Fatal Dowry*'. '*The Fatal Dowry*' certainly shows higher poetic and perhaps dramatic power. But there is one point in which Rowe has excelled Massinger, and for which no one seems disposed to give him justice. Without entering into a discussion of the requisites, objects and aims of plays it is granted that truth to life, and the moral of the fable are two weighty parts in the ensemble of perfection. In the moral Massinger is superior. That no young girl will ever be misled by the example of Beaumelle, is certainly true. Beaumelle can offer no excuse for the passion she entertains for Novall jr. Therein is the moral made more forcible. His character excites no respect in our bosoms, and we naturally feel no improper sympathy for her who sins with him. He is not calculated to gain love. For Lothario though, with all his faults, we still entertain a latent regard, for his elegant gallant bearing. We find it natural that a woman should fall in love with such a character, however much we condemn the love. In so far, Rowe excels his master in naturalness. Massinger made his hero a common fop, such as was an old acquaintance of play-goers of that day. Novall jr. has no individuality. Rowe on the contrary has made his hero so true to life, and such an accurate type of a certain class, that he still represents the 'Gay Lothario' of to-day, as well as in his own time. That no such character ever existed in real life is, strictly speaking, true. But a representative of a class must contain all the distinguishing characteristics of that class in greater or less degree. No one of the class which Lothario represents contains all of his characteristics, but in each member of this class will be some characteristic which unites him with the rest of his brotherhood; and Rowe has most successfully reproduced all of these individual but still uniting traits in the gay Lothario. We speak of a Shylock, an Othello, my Uncle Toby, an old Major Pendennis, an Overreach, and so we speak of a Gay Lothario. It has become the custom for each writer on this subject to scathe Rowe for having

plundered Massinger. All merge the mental in the moral man and torture this poor dummy with seemingly exquisite satisfaction. As Sir Aston says, 'Give to each his due'. Rowe was a rogue, but a talented one. In other respects, he has not done so well. But even then, judged from his own standpoint, he has done better than those critics allow, who survey his work from that particular angle at which Massinger viewed '*The Fatal Dowry*'. '*The Fatal Dowry*', apart from '*The Fair Penitent*', is a grand conception, the execution pleasing and full, in diction chaste and elegant. The character of Charalois, the chief charm of the play, has been neatly and appropriately described as 'a Hamlet whose mind has not been sicklied o'er by the pale cast of thought'.

25. A New Way to pay Old Debts. C.

Malone says 'this play does not appear to have been licensed for the stage'. This is Massinger's masterpiece in comedy. It was printed 1632—33, 4^o.¹) This is the only one of Massinger's plays which still holds its place upon the stage, and 'a distinguished place'. Hallam calls the character of Sir Giles Overreach 'a masterly conception'. Though wanting in wit Massinger's humour in this is finer and more subtle than in any other of his plays. Its greatest fault, which Hazlitt has pointed out, is the unnaturalness, of such a character as Overreach being swayed by the desire for such a bauble as an earl's coronet for his daughter.

26. The City Madam. C.

This was acted in 1632. Printed 4^o 1659. It has been altered and adapted several times. The B. D. mentions *Riches or The Wife and Brother*, play (founded on Massinger's Comedy of '*The City Madam*') by Sir James Bland Burgess, Bart. acted with success, by Drury Lane Co. at the Lyceum. 8^o 1810. Sir James has judiciously pruned the indelicate shoots of the original, but in other respects we can not consider all his alte-

¹) This play has also been translated into German: printed in one volume Leipzig 1874, under the title of 'Zwei meisterwerke des alten Englischen dramas: *Neues recept, alte schulden zu zahlen*. Intriguen-lustspiel in 5 acten von Philip Massinger etc.' von S. Gätschenberger. The translator has seen proper to make some changes in the plot, by which he thinks it becomes more natural. The propriety of the change, in spite of Hazlitt's authority, is very doubtful.

rations as improvements. For instance, Massinger in the commencement of his play, shows us Luke in the light of a villain, by making him tamper and dissemble with the clerks, in order to betray them. Of course we are not surprised at his subsequent conduct. On the contrary, Sir James impresses us with an idea of Luke's honesty in the afore-said counting-house scene, and thus renders almost incredible his extraordinary villainy afterwards. On the whole, however, we see much less room for blame than praise in this adaption of Massinger's long neglected drama to the audiences of the 19th century. There is another alteration, called '*The Cure of Pride*', by Mr. Love, which was never printed.

27. *The Guardian*. C.

Was licensed 1633. Printed 8^o 1655. The proper title of this play is '*The City Honest Man or The Guardian*', being so entered in the Stationer's book 1653. It is too well known now by the above name to allow it to be changed. Farquhar is said to have imitated '*The Guardian*' in '*The Inconstant*'. The resemblance is very general, and perhaps only one partial to Massinger would have noticed it. The incident of Jolante and Calista is said to have been borrowed.

28. *Cleander*. T.

Licensed 1634. Never printed. The only fact known of this play is that the Queen Henrietta went to see it, shortly after it was licensed. Gifford thinks this, being so unusual was a high compliment either to Massinger or to the merits of the piece.

29. *The Bashful Lover*. C.

Licensed 1636. Printed in 1655. 8^o. Revived in 1798 at Covent Garden with success. The title of this play was entered on the Stationer's Register as *Alexius, the Chaste Gallant or The Bashful Lover*. Gifford supposed this to have been two plays. '*The Bashful Lover*', '*The Guardian*' and '*A Very Woman*' were printed in one volume 8^o in 1655, a year or more after they had been entered upon the Register. Each of these plays was entered as having two titles, but in the printed volume they have each but one of the two. The only explanation (on the supposition that they were rightly inscribed) seems to be this. They had been given at first under one of the titles, had then received some alterations, and been brought upon

the stage again, some time after. No mention is made of the fact in the prologues of *'The Guardian'* or *'The Bashful Lover'* which is very strange, but such is the case as regards *'A Very Woman'*. *'The Bashful Lover'* was acted in 1636, and the prologue which we yet have was spoken then. In 1639 was given *'Alexius the chaste Gallant'*. From this it would seem that the name had been changed, in order to bring it out as a new drama. The publishers, in order not to be defrauded of their copyright, entered both titles, but in printing them, the second title to each was omitted. We know *'A Very Woman'* to have been so revived; *'The Bashful Lover'* must have been. Of the second title of *'The Guardian'*, we know nothing. Malone does not mention it, nor does Mr. Cunningham in his Extracts. But being so entered on the Register, it must of necessity be so. The authority of the Register is oft doubtful as regards authorship. In respect to titles, it is the best we have. From this we see the two titles denote the same play, as also that the two titles of *'The Bashful Lover'* denote the same play. What the name Alexius has to do with *'The Bashful Lover'*, as we now have it, is not easily seen. The B. D. exposes a literary hoax, which was attempted with this play. Under the head of *'The Bashful Lovers'*, Jacob and after him Whincope mention a Tragi-Comedy with this title, to which are prefixed the letters B. J. 'Whence they seem to infer Ben Jonson to have been the author, but as the other catalogues take no notice of this play, and the date, size of edition, and place of performance are all the same as in the last mentioned piece (i. e. *'The Bashful Lover'*), we cannot help conjecturing that it may be the same, with only the difference of a spurious title-page, to pass it on the world as a work of Ben Jonson's.'

30. The King and The Subject. T.

Was licensed 1638. Sir Henry Herbert found this play to contain much dangerous matter, a specimen of which he has recorded, and only allowed it after having expunged much from it. He tells us that the title was changed. Malone suspects it was new named *'The Tyrant'*. This latter play had been licensed in 1611, as shown before. So that this could not have been the same play. A similarity of name, so superficial as that between the titles of these two plays, is no argument. This has been lost, never having been printed.

31. The Prisoner or The Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo.

This was first given as two plays, this however has been rectified. It was acted in 1640, entered on the Register 1653, but never printed, and hence lost.

The author imagines he has possibly discovered a key for that most intricate problem, in what plays Massinger and Fletcher wrote together? The MS. of '*The Tyrant*', as now preserved in the British Museum¹⁾, has experienced many interlineations and changes. These changes are mostly in a different handwriting from that in which the play is written itself. By comparing the handwriting in which the play is written with Massinger's known handwriting, one can not fail to recognize the resemblance. The changes — in whose handwriting are they? They must have been made at the time, when Massinger was writing with Fletcher. They were doubtless made by the latter. I do not know what MSS. of Massinger and Fletcher are still extant. But by a careful comparison of the handwritings in '*The Tyrant*', with those of the MSS. which we still have, one could, without doubt, arrive at some gratifying result.

¹⁾ The MS. of Massinger's '*Sero sed Serio*' is in the British Museum, Royal MSS. XVIII. A. 20.; and from this we learn his autograph and handwriting. See '*Autographs* J. G. Nichols. London 1829'.
